

# THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

---

Vol. XV.

October, 1918

No. 4

---

## THEOLOGY AFTER THE WAR.

BY PROFESSOR H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M. A., RAWDON  
COLLEGE, ENGLAND.

The war has created no new problem for theology. It has brought home to the popular imagination old problems on a vast and unprecedented scale, and so far will without doubt have a deep and far-reaching influence upon religion. The "average man" has been compelled to think about the reality of providence, the significance of prayer, the possibilities of life beyond death, with widely different individual conclusions. There is an increased impatience with unrealities, and a greater sense of freedom in rejecting them, though this may fall far short of an earnest demand for realities. The truth seems to be that the war is a landmark in the history of theology rather in relation to the past than to the future. The war will serve, in fact, to mark off four hundred years of Protestant theology, of which period the last phase began some hundred and forty years ago, with the critical philosophy of Kant. As the roots of Mediævalism are planted in the life and thought of the Ancient Church, and those of Protestant theology in the life and thought of the Middle Ages, so we may expect to find the theology of the future era already begun in the tendencies of the period that lies behind us. The surest prophecies are interpretations of the past.

## I. THE MODERN EMPHASIS ON RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.

The most significant feature of the theology of the last century has been the increasing emphasis on religious experience as the starting-point of constructive thinking. The spirit of the biological laboratory has replaced that of the old-fashioned museum. If men are interested in religion today, their interest, practical and theoretical, largely centers in the facts of religious experience. Our own generation has seen a new science come to birth—the science of the psychology of religion. The study of conversions has become a topic for the journalist, and such books as James' *Varieties of Religious Experience* have made a very wide appeal and exercised a correspondingly great influence. In philosophy proper, as distinct from psychology, the central line of modern development is a new consciousness of the values of personality. It may be seen, for example, in Professor Pringle-Pattison's admirable survey of modern philosophy entitled *The Idea of God*—one of the best recent books to show a student the direction in which philosophy is moving. The author says quite explicitly that the central problem for the modern philosopher is "the assertion of the objectivity of our fundamental estimates of value". Nor is the problem confined to the philosopher, for a characteristic difficulty of many thoughtful men and women today springs from the temptation to explain religious experience as auto-suggestion. Moreover, there has been something of a mass-movement toward a genuinely experiential religion, the tendencies of which find expression in the popular antithesis of the heart and the brain:

"A warmth within the breast would melt  
The freezing reason's colder part,  
And like a man in wrath the heart  
Stood up and answered 'I have felt'."

This may be seen in the rise and growth of religious movements with the minimum of what is generally known



as "dogma", for example, the Brotherhood and Adult School movements, and the claims to offer a new and more genuinely religious experience made by Christian Science, Theosophy, and Spiritualism. Huxley expressed in choice language that which many have been seeking in the last generation or two:

"A church in which, week by week, services should be devoted, not to the iteration of abstract propositions in theology, but to the setting before men's minds of an ideal of true, just, and pure living; a place in which those who are weary of the burden of daily cares should find a moment's rest in the contemplation of the higher life which is possible for all, though attained by so few; a place in which the man of strife and of business should have time to think how small, after all, are the rewards he covets compared with peace and charity." (*Methods and Results*, p. 284.)

I am not, of course, suggesting that such a Church as Huxley and so many others want is at all possible; they are asking for the consolation of great truths without the truths, for the comfort of the divine Fatherhood without the reality of the Father given in Christ's person and work, for Christian ethics without Christian faith. But this line of thought is represented in not a little of our war-time literature, and its emphasis is significant. May we not see the same emphasis more subtly illustrated in present tendencies toward ecclesiastical reunion? There is felt to be a basis of experiential unity underneath all our differences, however difficult it may be for us to express it in the constitution of the one Church which is the body of Christ. This consciousness seems to underlie the argument of such a book as *Unity and Schism*, by the editor of the *Church Times*, the Rev. T. A. Lacey. The unity of the Church, he says, is the unity of redeemed mankind. "All Christians are brothers. Orthodox and heretic, Catholic and schismatic, all are brothers. \* \* \* We are, in point of fact, one divided family, and the first step

toward reconciliation is the acknowledgement of brotherhood.'"

We can trace, then, a real and increasing emphasis on religious experience in these psychological, philosophical, popular, and ecclesiastical tendencies, an emphasis which the influence of the war is likely to increase rather than diminish, whatever be the ultimate form of practical expression, ethical, evangelical, or sacramental. The analysis is confirmed when we test the theology of the last century by its most outstanding representatives. The two conspicuous names are those of Schleiermacher and Ritschl. A friend of mine once asked the late Dr. Denney what he considered the most essential equipment for the constructive theologian. His answer was, "A knowledge of Calvin, Schleiermacher and Ritschl—nobody else counts in the same degree." I remember discussing this answer with another friend, a man of massive erudition in the history of theology, and he said, "The only addition I should make is Thomas Aquinas—then you have the four great makers of theological system, the four great representatives." The significant thing is the fact that the two foremost theologians of the nineteenth century are both pioneers in the school of experiential theology. Schleiermacher initiated the school and introduced the positive phase of the new epoch by basing his *System of Faith* on an analysis of religious experience. Ritschl went further in developing the same method and in combining the experiential with the modern social interest. If the past can teach anything about the future, the line they opened up is the line of future development. The chief result of the scientific and historical criticism of religion and theology in the last century has been to throw us back on the citadel of experiential faith, in which to rally our forces. In this concentration on vital experience, as the new point of departure, theology becomes scientific in the best sense. It learns to appeal to evidence that can be tested, and offers proof of its reality. Sir



Francis Darwin tells us, in his *Rustic Sounds*, that "when science began to flourish at Cambridge in the 'seventies', and the university was asked to supply money for buildings, an eminent person objected and said, 'What do they want with their laboratories? Why can't they believe their teachers, who are in most cases clergymen of the Church of England?'" Perhaps theology is passing into its laboratory stage, not simply for a few select thinkers, pioneers of the future, but for the rank and file of thoughtful men and women, and we are moving, in fact, toward the democratization of theology.

There is, of course, a familiar objection to any appeal to religious experience as the basis for constructive theology. "How can you appeal", it is said, "to anything so varied, so subjective, so elusive, as the religious experience of the individual?" "Do you not sacrifice the authority of the Church and of the Scriptures in order to give a quite exaggerated importance to passing phases of life?" "What stability, and what standard of truth can we hope to find in the shifting sands of popular feeling?" The answer is simply this—that the approach to theology through experience does not mean purely individualistic experience at all, does not leave room for the crank and the fanatic, does not reject, but is rather thrown back the more on the inherent authority of both the Church and of the Scriptures as the classical sources from which experience is renewed, and by which individual and transient phases of experience may be tested. Any movement in theology which makes light of either the Church or the Bible as sources, standards, permanent factors in experience, is condemned to failure. But to say this is very different from asking men to accept truth simply because it is part of the traditions of the Church, or is found in the literature of the old or new Israel. The Christian experience that concerns the theologian is catholic experience, sifted and tested. It includes not only the present age, but all ages. It believes with Newman,

*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*'''. But its approach is through the indisputable facts of the Christian consciousness—that men have to struggle against something the theologian has called sin, in their own hearts and in the world, that there is a relation of faith which does give new energy to conquer in this struggle for the highest elements of manhood, that man's life is not purely individual but also social, his full development being reached only in relation to other men, so that the fellowship of the Church is the necessary complement to a full manhood, and that the historic events in which the Bible culminates have been the beginning of a new experience for men, without which history itself is unintelligible. The interpretations of this experience are as varied as men's temperaments and environments, and the experience itself, as specifically Christian, must be related both to the larger mass of religious experience and to the data of the ethical consciousness. But we need not fear that a reasoned and scientific resort to the theology of experience will ever sacrifice the essential principle of authority. It will rather serve to restore both Bible and Church to the place they claim and deserve by finding its highest and deepest values enshrined within them.

## II. THE CENTRAL DOCTRINE—THE HOLY SPIRIT.

If, then, theology after the war follows the line of progress already indicated, and even more explicitly builds on religious experience as its direct and primary foundation, the central doctrine for the immediate future will be that of the Holy Spirit. Christian experience is not a self-contained development, a growth in thought, feeling, and will that can be explained in purely ethical terms. From the New Testament times onward, though in very varied terminology, those who share in that experience claim that it is inexplicable apart from its supernatural factor, immanent and transcendent. Indeed, con-



scious faith in the operation of this factor is the normal condition of the experience. Our fellowship with God through Christ is much more than the memory of a historical Person; it is mutual companionship, communion, interaction and intercourse. Without the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, conceived as God taking the things of Christ and declaring them vitally unto us, there is a lacuna in the Christian scheme. The Christian interpretation of Christian experience therefore necessarily involves the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; to emphasize one is to emphasize the other. Moreover, the broader doctrine of the Spirit of God (in which the doctrine of the Holy Spirit through Jesus Christ is the highest specialization) enables us to relate Christian experience to the results of the comparative study of religion on the one hand, and to the general ethical consciousness on the other. Whether we ask, then, for a specific Christian theology, or for the larger philosophy of religion and of life, our first need is for an adequate doctrine of the Spirit of God, that is, of God dwelling in man, and of God's Being in the light of that indwelling. This may be seen in each of the three main types of Christian experience, the Quaker, the evangelical, and the sacramental. Of the first, it is not necessary to speak, for the emphasis is clear and explicit, and the need is rather to relate it adequately with the historical element in Christian truth, the realities of history. In the evangelical type of Christian experience, going back to the personal acceptance of cardinal truths, the emphasis is less obvious. These truths are to be found in the Scriptures, which record the faith and experience of the earliest disciples. But the acceptance of them which evangelical experience implies is much more than a merely intellectual assent. The Protestant Reformers taught the activity of the Spirit of God in securing that trust in Christ and that obedience to Him which was essential to Christianity. They saw that it was necessary to link the Word of God as found in Scripture with the

conscious response of the believer, by means of the doctrine of the Spirit, though they failed to work out any adequate doctrine of the authority of Scripture over against the authority of the Church. The Word became for them the great Sacrament, and the Spirit of God operated through it. Now that the *eternal* authority of the Bible is largely replaced by that of its *inherent* truth and worth, the modern evangelical is thrown back more than ever on the doctrine of the Spirit, as the guarantee that God is really present to the believer's heart, through the medium of His Word, literary or incarnate.

The sacramental type of experience similarly depends on certain great truths, but emphasizes the mediation of their efficacy through appointed channels of divine grace. Here we still need the doctrine of the Spirit for any adequate *apologia* of the sacraments. This may be seen, for example, from Paget's definition of the sacraments in *Lux Mundi*:

"By the sacramental system, then, is meant the regular use of sensible objects, agents, and acts, as being the means and instruments of divine energies, 'the vehicles of saving and sanctifying grace' \* \* \* God's Holy Spirit bears into the faithful soul the communication of its risen Lord's renewing manhood; and for the conveyance of that unseen gift He takes things and acts which can be seen, and words that can be heard; His way is viewless as the wind; but He comes and works by means of which the senses are aware; and His hidden energy accepts a visible order and outward implements for the achievement of His purpose."

When the statement is made in such terms as these, there is certainly no irreconcilable antithesis between most of those who are called evangelicals and many of those who are called sacramentalists; indeed, an adequate doctrine of the Holy Spirit would seem to offer the best approach to an *eirenicon*. Words are things, and things are words; the real point of importance is that the Spirit



of God does work through them both in actual Christian experience. We are sometimes told that one result of the war will be a revival of the sacramental emphasis in religion. That would, at any rate, be preferable to a vague and lifeless evangelicalism. The real value of the sacramental emphasis would depend on the degree to which it was accompanied by a noble doctrine of the Spirit of God, and an equally noble charity and sympathy as one of the practical fruits of the Spirit. We may yet be brought to share the communion of the one table of the Lord, visibly as well as spiritually.

### III. THE NEW APPROACH TO THE GREAT DOCTRINES.

We must not look for any startling and dramatic change through the new emphasis. At most, the war will rend the veil that has hidden the slow and subtle changes of the past generation or two. We may think of a man growing up in some narrow and exclusive belief, which he goes on defending long after it has been exposed to disintegrating influences. His old creed, still tenaciously held, gradually becomes symbolic to him. He maintains it, by looking through it into something more Catholic, which he unconsciously identifies with it. Then, one day, some incident serves to reveal to him how far he has moved from the letter of the old belief, which has been but a shadow of things to come. So the author of the epistle to the Hebrews constructed his *apologia*, feeling that he still retained all that was permanent in the old, though he had now reached a new and worthier expression for the larger truth.

The doctrine of salvation which many of us hold today is still in large measure inarticulate. The new emphasis is there, but it is found together with formulae which belong to another emphasis. Few Christian men would now assert that all outside their own communion are lost. In practice, we almost all recognize the diver-

sity of expression in the forms of faith. But, in theory, many still cling instinctively to conventional statements of what salvation is, largely because no adequate formula for our broader practice has been attained. The result in relation to the outsider is disastrous. Dr. Forsyth says with truth that "the religious consciousness has taken a form to which the theological phrasing of it that carried the old heroisms has ceased to appeal". A recent report to the Wesleyan Methodist Conference puts down the estrangement of the present generation from the Church largely to the clinging to old presentations of the doctrines of Christian experience. We have to broaden *and deepen* our theory of what salvation is. The examples of faith given in the eleventh chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews are very varied, and some of them are unconventional enough. Yet to the greater breadth of view there corresponds a greater depth. There is an intensity of sacrifice in which the faith of these men found utterance, which guarantees its genuineness and more than atones for its unconventionality. Now it would be somewhat on these lines that our modern view of salvation would have to be framed. The definition would not be in terms either of a particular sacrament or a particular doctrine, but rather of a right relation to other persons, to the whole group of which the man is part. That relation begins with the little group of the home; it goes on expanding to the full horizon of humanity; it transcends that horizon in finding God. If that right relation to other persons, to the point of readiness for sacrifice, be wanting, we feel that no orthodoxy of opinion can be a substitute for it. If it is there, if it is therein imperfect, because in incomplete ways, and within a narrow circle that has not realized its own inherent elasticity, we feel that the man is in the way of salvation. All true loyalties, all natural pieties, all noble enthusiasms, all duties are found within it; the passion for social righteousness and for scientific truth may both be expressed in terms of it;



the sacrificial love of man for man is seen to be akin to the sacrificial love of man for God, and is indeed its essential form. In such a conception of salvation, springing directly from our modern sense of personal values, we have virtually transcended the older dichotomy of two distinct worlds. We have entered the eternal realm of things that death, merely physical death, cannot touch. We have answered some insistent questions about the limits of human probation. Death becomes an incident in the providence of God, whilst the eternal fortunes of the individual are linked to the eternal aspect of his relation to other men and to God, a relation not necessarily to be measured by his own explicit consciousness of it.

Take another doctrine, that of the atonement, which follows on naturally from this view of sacrificial relationship. The war has brought nothing so forcibly home to the hearts of men as the suffering of the innocent with and through the guilty. The solidarity of the race is set plainly before men's eyes. However unjustly it may seem to work out in the individual instance, the fact is there, and it is an undeniable fact of life. If the solidarity of the race really extends to Him in whose image it is made, whose divine nature it is destined to partake, then there is nothing strange to our experience in the doctrine that God in His Son suffers with and through the guilty race of men. But the atonement, of course, means more than this. It means that the cross, the culminating point of the life of Christ, somehow enriches the world and becomes in the old metaphor, which we have forgotten is a metaphor, a sacrifice. How shall we express the worth of that sacrifice? Here is the point at which doctrines of the atonement so often fail to satisfy men's thought and conscience. No artificial theory of the worth of the sacrifice will permanently appeal to men, and every theory must be in terms of the living thought of the age to which it would appeal. For us, this means emphasis on the positive worth of the personal values in the life and death of

our Lord. It means that the sacrifices made by men for all true ends have their own far-off but real kinship with the sacrifice of the cross. "Nothing is lost", Bourget finely says, "when we make an offering of it". The modern definition of the atonement must be in some such terms as these, rather than in those of animal sacrifice, or slave-ransom, or financial debt, or legal penalty. Such modern approach to the atonement, whilst asserting a new relation to God constituted by the work of Christ, also gives a new significance to the apostle's conviction that he filled up that which was lacking in the sufferings of Christ, and that he was poured out as a drink-offering upon the sacrifice and service of other men's faith. Whilst we look to the one perfect Offering of the Son of God to make atonement for our sin, may we not also feel the inspiration of the thought that the Spirit of Christ dwelling in His disciples goes on to complete in their imperfect sacrifices His own work of redemption, since their best is His gift and inspiration? Along some such lines as these, the cross may yet come closer to the lives and hearts of men than our generation has ever seen.

A further illustration can here be no more than suggested—that of the doctrine of God. The war has helped to popularize the old Gnostic and Manichæan heresy of a finite God, and that specious dualism is a natural reaction from abstract Absolutism, prompted not only by speculative difficulties, but by the desire to find a God in genuine contact with the struggle of human life, sharing our daily strife here and now, as well as long ago on the far-off hill of Calvary. What is this but a desire for that Real Presence of God which the doctrine of the Holy Spirit declares, a doctrine so largely neglected in that fourth century when the traditional doctrine of the Trinity was framed? Only the approach to God from *within* the experience of a growing fellowship with Him can yield that for which so many are seeking, a conception of God warm with our life-blood, clear through the historic revelation in Christ, majestic in transcendent love. This



it is to have access in the Spirit through Christ to the Father.

Are we to look for some great personality to arise, a pioneer of Christian thought who shall translate our confused and inarticulate convictions into a working formula of churchmanship and evangelism? That has happened in both of the great crises with which we might compare the present. When Alaric and the Goths sacked Rome in 410, it seemed the downfall of civilization. But Augustine, in his "City of God", laid the foundation-thought of the Mediæval Church. Again, when the Renaissance destroyed the authority of that Church, Luther gave to the world a new life through his emphasis on justification by faith instead of works. A third in the great succession may come to emphasize for us the supernatural over against and yet within the natural, and to give us in simple and effective formula the Christian guarantee of moral and spiritual values. But there is another alternative. I have already used the phrase, "the democratization of theology". The progress of theology after the war may depend on a mass-movement of religion rather than on the dominating influence of this or that great pioneer. Whilst the expert will keep his necessary place in technical studies, and in the philosophical articulation of thought, the plain man may come to see that the vital things are common ground and demand from theology a fuller correspondence with that truth of religion. The result would be a greater simplification of issues, a wider variety of statement within the common loyalty to Christ, and the restatement of theology in terms of humanity rather than of intellectual system. The doctrine of the Spirit is the democratic doctrine of theology, for it declares that all men may be kings and priests unto God, it interprets the ethical consciousness of men as a royal commission direct from God, it enforces at once the uniqueness of each life in its contribution to the knowledge of God, and the fellowship of the one Body of Christ, into which we were all baptized in one Spirit.

## JAMES MARION FROST: DEFENDER OF THE FAITH.

BY REVEREND W. W. LANDRUM, D.D., LL.D.,  
LOUISVILLE, KY.

James Marion Frost, doctor of divinity, for a quarter of a century was a defender of the faith; that is to say, of the faith he believed to be "the faith once for all delivered to the saints".

That faith or substance of doctrine, as he understood it, is evangelical and it is Baptist. It is American Baptist as distinguished from British Baptist, being that type of American Baptist orthodoxy dominant in the Southern States of his native land. In his own mind, always modestly but firmly held, defended and propagated, was the ineradicable conviction that the need of Christendom today is a return to the New Testament norm in deed and creed. That norm, as he was unalterably persuaded, is to be seen, at least as an ideal and aim, in any truly regenerated, properly organized, intelligent, consecrated, and efficient spiritual democracy known as a Baptist church, fraternally co-operating with like bodies of believers, for the furtherance of the Kingdom of God on earth.

The foregoing characterization, however regarded by others, formed through thirty years of fellowship with him, is that of loyalty and love. The proof of its fairness and accuracy is found in his own deliverances, vocal and written.

James Marion Frost definitely and determinedly was a denominationalist. Birth, breeding, education, environment, personal experience and preference, and all the forces, both human and divine, that make personality account for this fact. Constitutionally he was a religious conservative. With him, in all interpretations of Chris-



tianity as expressed in the New Testament, whatsoever is new is not true and whatsoever is true is not new. Naturally, therefore, he stood up and stood out, with charity for all but with apologies to none, for a clear-cut creed, authorative, sufficient, and final, "no alterations in it, no additions to it, no subtractions from it".

Kentucky has been the "dark and bloody ground" of interdenominational strife. The subject of these lines was born in Kentucky. This occurred in the year 1849. He was converted and baptized in 1860, when only twelve years of age, and licensed to preach in 1868 at eighteen; he graduated at Georgetown College in 1871 and was ordained in the same year. Immediately he became pastor, serving from time to time through the years, churches as follows: Maysville, Ky.; Upper Street, Lexington, Ky.; the First Church, Staunton, Va.; that of Selma, Ala.; Leigh Street Church, Richmond, Va., and the First Church, Nashville, Tenn.

No opportunity was given Mr. Frost to pursue a theological course at a seminary. To the end of his life it was a source of regret to him, as he frequently declared that he had not enjoyed as a preparation for his life work a course of systematic study at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. He became a trustee of that institution and was its loyal friend and a generous benefactor in providing, through the Sunday School Board, means for founding a chair of Sunday School Pedagogy. So far as in him lay, he urged all candidates for the ministry to add to college training a thorough course in theology. His appreciation and advocacy of theological education were all the more eager and earnest because he realized he had suffered loss by not undertaking it. It was difficult, if not quite impracticable, to repair this loss, in any satisfactory way, by judicious reading and reflection while burdened with the cares of a pastorate. It was only after he became secretary of the Sunday School Board that he was allowed the calm still air of sequestered study

which gave occasion for the books that came from his pen.

The defender of "the faith once for all delivered to the saints" in the Southern Baptist interpretation, became such in a normal way when put in charge of the only publishing house under the management of Southern Baptists, itself the child of his own brain. The polemic literature of the denomination was enriched by these productions of the pen of Dr. Frost: *Pedobaptism: Is it From Heaven or of Men?* *The Moral Dignity of Baptism*, *The Memorial Supper of Our Lord*, *The School of the Church*, *Our Church Life*. Besides, he compiled *Baptist Why and Why Not*, *An Experience of Grace*, *The Baptist Message*, *Christian Union*, and *Evangelism and Baptism*.

These books, written in a kindly spirit and simple style easy to understand, are everywhere accepted among Southern Baptists as suitable text-books for the youth of their people and as valuable aids to the indoctrination of the ministry and membership of the churches.

Right here, let it be stated for reasons that will appear, that the best contribution made by Dr. Frost to the Baptists of the South was himself. As a spiritual force he enveloped the brotherhood in their annual Conventions like the atmosphere. The heritage he left is a pure personality. Unselfish, he was far-seeing, fraternal, persisting not only in what he has written and in the publishing house which he founded and raised to a success most remarkable, but also in the hearts he touched and made tender, in the lives he molded and made strong, and in the *esprit du corps* he imparted to militant thousands. Possibly no man among us was more universally regarded as sage, saint, and seer. All his brethren believed his to be a stainless soul. On this account, he was the beloved John.

Baptists of a liberal school are to be found in the South. These, accepting what they maintain are the assured results of modern scientific methods of Bible study and



cherishing, with more or less consistency, views of co-operation with Christian bodies, other than Baptist, that Dr. Frost feared as disloyal if not suicidal, have never raised any question as to the sincerity of his motives or the sweetness of his temper or the transparent genuineness of his character. He was what he seemed to be, and he seemed to be what he was. The man on that account holds an assured place in the affections alike of literalist and liberal, the reactionary and the reforming groups in a brotherhood as diverse as the waves and as joined as the sea. Hence the assertion that Dr. Frost's supreme gift to his denomination was himself.

Dr. Frost, slow in his thinking processes, sober, dignified, self-restrained, courteous, even magnanimous to an adversary, was a constructive force. He fronted the future and built his denominational plans accordingly. Edification projected by him was along the lines of denominational solidarity, denominational expansion, denominational comity, denominational efficiency through denominational training, chiefly in denominational schools, in a denominational atmosphere and under denominational control. As a denominational statesman he aimed at nothing less than denominational supremacy, through spiritual means and methods, in the South, and through the South, of America and the world. So far as he was a seer, this was his vision—a redeemed and regenerated mankind conforming in teaching and practice to the Southern Baptist standards. The time was ripe, as he saw it, for a worthy Baptist world consciousness. That world consciousness should think in continents. It should plan for millenniums. It should aspire to promote the universal lordship of Jesus Christ. That lordship requires strict obedience to the New Testament in moral commands, evangelical commands, positive commands.

Albeit, this stupendous conception seemed to Dr. Frost infinitely removed from sectarianism. It was not bigotry. It was in no sense provincial or partisan, in his

judgment, but simply and solely a sacred deposit of truth, the faith once for all delivered to the saints and by them to be given to the world for the world's highest good, both here and hereafter. By every consideration of intellectual honesty as well as loyalty to Christ and supreme concern for the present and future well-being of his fellow-men, he felt he was and must be a Baptist, by which he meant a Christian of the original New Testament type, from core to cuticle, all the way up and all the way down. As far as he could do so, he felt it his duty to induce everyone else to be and to confess to being a Baptist. This is only saying that the good man, while never claiming infallibility for himself, was never hesitant in proclaiming the infallible and imperishable infallibility of God's Word, and that Word interpreted not infallibly, to be sure, but more nearly so than by anyone else by the acknowledged leaders of his Baptist brethren. His creed was to him as stable as the mountains and as shining as the stars. Of its ultimate triumph he had no doubt.

As much if not more than any other leader among us during the last half century, Dr. Frost solidified Southern Baptists in the matter of Sunday school materials and methods.

From the close of the Civil War up to 1891, the American Baptist Publication Society of Philadelphia was the one institution that expressed and promoted Baptist unity in this country. Its Sunday school lesson-papers and periodicals, written by Southern as well as Northern scholars, went into all Baptist churches South as well as North. This condition was quite pleasing to many leaders in both sections. It was destined not to last. Some things appearing in the Society's publications excited criticism, chiefly things showing differences between Northern and Southern Baptists in minor matters of ecclesiasticism and organization. These differences widened. Suspicion of Northern orthodoxy was aroused. Differences in politics, always causing friction between

the sections so soon after the Civil War, to some extent colored everything in the Southern mind. The South, in a word, gradually became unwilling to co-operate with a society that it no longer trusted as a safe expounder of the faith once for all given to the saints.

At such a crisis a leader was needed to champion Southern views. Dr. Frost brooded over the unhappy situation. For months he thought of nothing else. At last a vision from Heaven, as he believed, illumined his mind and pointed the way. It offered intellectual and credal independence on the part of the Southern churches. It meant a Southern Baptist Sunday School Board with its own publishing house and its own publications squaring its teachings in all particulars with the accepted standards of Southern Baptist orthodoxy, ecclesiasticism, traditions, and denominational administration of affairs.

That vision, beating in his blood, inspiring his mind, quickening all his energies, wholly engaging his time, and commanding his voice and pen for weeks and months, materialized. Dr. Frost captured the Southern Baptist Convention. Over the opposition of men justly esteemed among the very first in wisdom and piety, he carried out his dream. His imperial spirit embodied itself. An institution arose amid the shouts of his brethren from the Potomac to the Rio Grande and from the Ohio to the Gulf, which, through its culture of the rising generation, developes Southern Baptist consciousness and binds into unity all agencies for denominational expansion. This result is a monument to the splendid victory and constructive foresight and generalship of the one man whose name heads this article. It is a most astonishing achievement in the light of all the conditions of opposition overcome.

An uncompromising denominationalist by the nature of the case is a diplomat. A diplomat feels it to be his first duty to be loyal to the interests of his own country. To such a school of diplomacy Dr. Frost belonged. The



art of living together harmoniously on fraternal terms, wherein is no compromise of principle, he advocated for his own people and between them and all others within and without the fold of nominal Christianity. Living with others, not of his own communion, had its limitations. These he clearly marked out. No man was more pronounced than he in opposition to the slightest approach to any merger that would weaken the dogmatic denominational barriers his stalwart conscience had put up between Baptists and pedo-Baptists. Entangling alliances with bodies of divergent belief and practice, though evangelical and Protestant, he roundly condemned. Baptist isolation in all their educational and missionary activities he deemed best, not only for Baptists but for the Kingdom of God at large. Believing as he did that Baptist principles rightly understood and sanely and consistently and energetically applied are the hope of evangelical religion, he could not co-operate in an organized way with those unwilling to admit his claim.

The positive ordinances of the New Testament baptism and the Lord's Supper, as Baptists hold them, he interpreted in the highest spiritual way but without sacramentarian mysticism. With an enthusiasm unequaled in the opinion of many, he set them forth as the mold of doctrine indispensable to the perpetuity of the symbolism of the gospel. To sacrifice their original form by an iota of concession to Christian comity would be treason to the throne of his ascended and reigning King.

The subject of this sketch, described in a word though never calling himself such, was essentially a high churchman. No English high churchman could be more confident of the apostolicity of his church organization. On the other hand, no British Baptist of the present day with his eagerness for Protestant unification, and probably not all Northern Baptists, would altogether understand, much less appreciate, the stalwart type of churchmanship which Dr. Frost embodied. No Roman Catholic

is more surely convinced of the infallibility of the pope speaking *ex cathedra* than was Dr. Frost of the infallibility of his Baptist confession of faith, drawn directly, carefully, and prayerfully from the inerrant New Testament.

Defender of the faith he was and yet no controversialist. Affirmation was his method, not debate. Public discussions with dissenting brethren, within or without the brotherhood, was not to his taste. Because of his pacific spirit, his gentleness, his knightly courtesy, his fraternal fairness, he recoiled from wordy contentions quite likely to degenerate into struggle for victory and not for truth. Rather, he preferred the personal interview or group conference. His humility was deep and characteristic. It showed itself in his manner, bearing, facial expression, and tones of voice. The most reverent of men, he lived in an atmosphere of prayer. He practiced the presence of God. Always before interviews with others touching religious matters, with even a so-called secular bearing, he prayed. Whatever he accomplished was wrought, as he had no question, not by keenness of intellect on his part, but by reason of the illuminating and guiding presence of the Holy Spirit. A mystic he was in the best sense of the word, believing that God, who is Spirit, directly communicated with his own spirit touching things related to His spiritual Kingdom. Those who were privileged to enter into the inner sanctuary of his Christian experience never for a moment doubted that he did enjoy private interviews with his Saviour, as real and at times as ecstatic, as those which were bestowed on rare saints of all ages possessing discernment and receptiveness. Whatever may be the judgment of the future concerning the beliefs and policies of Dr. Frost as a denominational leader, there will never come a reversal of the conviction of his contemporaries that he was a good man, fearing God, loving Christ, and ardently desirous of being all and doing all in his power to advance the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.

## THE DEATH OF CHRIST IN THE GOSPELS.

BY PROF. J. H. FARMER, MCMASTER UNIVERSITY, TORONTO.

There are two quite different ways in which the death of Christ is regarded today by men who profess to be Christians. If we represent His whole career by a line, the one view regards His death as simply the last point in the line, in no respect unique. It was just the last act of obedience, the last proof of His loyalty to righteousness. He died rather than do wrong. It was the glorious death of a martyr.

In His life and character He has shown us what God is like and what man ought to be. In Him, God and man meet and are at peace. Thus He effects our at-one-ment with God, and furnishes us an example and ideal. Our duty is to summon all our energy and will power so as to imitate Him, cherish His faith in God, and reproduce His character.

The other view agrees with the first in saying that Christ has revealed what God is and what we ought to be, that He died rather than do wrong, a martyr to the right, and has left us an example that we should follow in His steps. But it goes farther. It affirms that it was more than a martyr's death, the last moment in a holy life. It maintains that there was in His death something absolutely unique in His experience. It believes that, while up to that time He had enjoyed continuous and unbroken fellowship with the Father, on the cross that fellowship was ruptured; that while all along He sympathetically shared the sorrows of men and endured their opposition and hatred, yet through all that the inner joy of the Father's fellowship far outweighed the pain men caused Him; that, while on the cross, He suffered the very worst that men could do unto Him, it was not that but the rupture of fellowship that broke His heart. God did some-



thing. He laid on His servant the iniquity of us all; He set Him forth in His blood as the propitiation for our sins, that He might be righteous and pronounce righteous the one who has faith in Jesus. Men killed the body; the Father forsook Him, and that meant the death of the soul. He not only died at the hands of sinful men; He died for men's sins.

The former view stresses the incarnation and regards the death as a natural result; the latter stresses the death and regards the incarnation as preparing the way for that. The one offers us a hero and martyr for our emulation and inspiration; the other an atoning Saviour in the power of whose risen life we may hopefully undertake to follow in His steps.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the latter is the teaching of the apostles, whether we consult Peter (1 Pet. 1:18; 2:24; 3:18, etc.), or John (1 Jno. 4:10; Rev. 1:5; 5:9, etc.), or Paul. This is now very generally admitted, and those who object to it as unethical charge the apostles, Paul especially, with having perverted the original gospel and tell us we must choose between Nazareth and Tarsus, Jesus and Paul, the Gospels and the Epistles. They invite us to go back to Christ, not from the accretions of later Christianity to the Christ of the Bible, but from the Christ of the Gospels. Their hope is thus to eliminate atonement through blood and find support for a salvation through the ethics of Jesus. The purpose of this article is to accept the challenge and see whether after all the Gospels are not in perfect harmony with the Epistles in their stress upon the death of Christ and in the reason they assign for it.

1. We call attention first to

#### THE TWO ORDINANCES.

These are in the Gospels. The first is baptism. Paul, of course, regards it as a picture of our death and resurrection with Christ. It is our public symbolic declaration of faith in Him who died for us and rose again.

How is it in the Gospels? It is certainly given a strikingly important place. It is the opening scene of our earliest Gospel. It is Christ's first public act. But the act at once raises a question for which we must find a satisfactory answer. Jesus was baptized by John. But Mark tells us expressly that John's was a repentance baptism. The people "were baptized by John in the Jordan confessing their sins". How could Jesus accept such a baptism? The Gospels are agreed in this, that Jesus was without sin. He had no sins to repent of or confess. How then could he allow Himself to be baptized? John himself felt the incongruity. The only answer ethically satisfactory is the one that John somehow reached. He was "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world". In baptism, Jesus comes forward as man's substitute and in that symbol pledges Himself to fulfill all righteousness by dying for our sins and rising again for our salvation. That, in His own mind, baptism and death are so related is shown when a few weeks before His death He speaks of it as "a baptism with which He is to be baptized"—a saying, significantly enough, found in all the Synoptic Gospels. The fourth Gospel looks the same way, as is shown by the passage already quoted—words in which the Baptist introduces Jesus to His disciples and evidently based on the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.

So with the Lord's Supper. Paul's explicit statement that it shows forth the Lord's death is in complete harmony with the words of institution as recorded in the Gospels: "This is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." These words make it clear that when He says "This do in remembrance of me", the reference is specifically to Him in the act of dying for us. What we have in Paul is a just amplification of this. Indeed, Paul's may be simply the fuller report of what Jesus said. And it is at least possible that His words as reported in the sixth chapter of John's Gospel may have the same reference.

It is clear, therefore, that the ordinances are intended to remind us not of His incarnation or His spotless example, but of His death. The references are found in all three Synoptists and by implication in the fourth Gospel as well.

The fact is really an impressive one, and is in danger of being overlooked by those who in their revolt from externalism and ecclesiasticism tend to depreciate external rites. But we must remember that Jesus was face to face with one of the greatest cases of over-emphasis of external observances the world has ever seen, and that in spite of that He appointed these two. He must have had good reason for so doing. That He did so and that both remind us of His death shows that He attached to it very special importance.

2. The second point is

#### THE VOICE FROM HEAVEN.

On three occasions in the gospel narratives, the Father is represented as breaking the silence and speaking audibly. We should expect these to be occasions of unusual interest. The fact is, that on each of these occasions Jesus is thinking about His death and expressing His purpose to die that men may be delivered from sin.

The first was at His baptism and we have already seen that He was in that act pledging Himself to that very sacrifice. The Father whose heart of love is breaking over the sins of men, eager to let His forgiving and renewing grace flow out righteously toward them, is overjoyed as He beholds the great Sin-bearer giving Himself to His redemptive task. He can no longer refrain. So He breaks the silence and proclaims at once the Son's perfect obedience and His own satisfaction that through His death life may be given to men.

The second occasion was the transfiguration. A week before the disciples had confessed Jesus as Messiah. The greatness of that confession Jesus recognizes with exulta-



tion of soul, though He knew that there were in their minds sad misconceptions of what Messiahship involved. He proceeds to clarify their view by telling them that He is first to die and rise again from the dead, that the cross is the way to His throne. Peter protests and even dares to rebuke the Lord. Is it not strange that from the first mention of His death until now men have been so ready to object to it. Jesus instantly traces that objection to its source. Peter, who a moment before was a spokesman for the Father, now becomes the spokesman of Satan. Peter was honest indeed, but he was ignorant and needed light. The transfiguration is intended to give it to him. Dr. Campbell Morgan is quite right, I think, in saying that transfiguration would be the natural ending of the earthly life of the Sinless One. It was His right to pass into the heavenlies without dying. And Professor Johnston Ross in his remarkable little book on *The Universality of Jesus*, is also right in entitling his chapter on the transfiguration, "The Great Renunciation". Jesus renounced His right and reaffirmed His purpose to go to Jerusalem to die and by that exodus accomplish that deliverance of men from sin of which the exodus from Egypt under Moses was a type. It was about this He was speaking with Moses and Elijah. Peter, however, was cherishing other thoughts. This glory is more to his liking, and he proposes that they should abide there. It is largely as rebuke and answer to Peter that the Father speaks and bids them listen to His beloved Son as He discloses His determination to renounce the glory and go to the cross.

The third was during passion week. Greeks have come to see Jesus. As He sees them, a vision of the great Gentile harvest rises before Him and His soul is elated with the prospect. Then the cost of that harvest occurs to Him. It can come only through His death. "Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it beareth much fruit." From that

death He shrinks. "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify Thy name." There came the voice, "I have both glorified it and will glorify it again." And that there may be no mistake as to how it should be glorified, Jesus adds: "Now is the judgment of this world; now the prince of this world shall be cast out and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself." This he said signifying by what death He was destined to die. Thus in this as in the other cases, Jesus was speaking of His death for men's salvation when the Father spoke. May we say that the ordinances give us the mind of Jesus as to the importance of His death, while the voices from Heaven give us the mind of the Father.

3. The third gives us the mind of the Spirit as seen in

#### THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE GOSPELS.

In literature, as in art, there is such a thing as perspective. When an artist is painting the portrait of a little girl, he makes her the conspicuous object on the canvas. There may be mountains in the background, but, though absolutely they may occupy as much space on the canvas as the child, relatively they do not. They are made use of by the artist to bring out the portrait the more clearly and strikingly. It is so with the passion of our Lord in the Gospels.

We have been misled by the modern habit of regarding the Gospels as "Lives of Christ". They were not so intended. Take, for example, that of Mark, commonly supposed to be the earliest of them. It begins when Jesus was thirty years old, and does not tell us how much time is covered. Not a word is said about the first thirty years, and so far as this sketch is concerned, one could not be sure that He lived more than another year or two. The author is manifestly not giving us a biography. What is he giving? We must judge from the character of the

work itself. He begins with the ministry of John the Baptist and the baptism of Jesus. Then follow, in the first chapter, a brief account of the temptation, the calling of disciples, and a rapid sketch of His public activity, in which He is presented as a worker of miracles and a wonderfully original and authoritative teacher. In the second chapter, opposition begins. In the third, the leaders already determine to put Him to death; in the eighth, He tells the disciples that they will succeed. In the ninth comes the transfiguration from which august scene He returns expressly to die and so begin the six months' march to the cross, rapidly sketched in chapter ten. With chapter eleven, we enter Passion week, and before we have gone far in chapter fourteen we have reached the day of crucifixion. Practically one-third of the book is given to Passion week and nearly half of that to the day of His death.

And what we find in Mark is practically true of the others—the chief difference being that in Matthew and Luke a couple of chapters are devoted to His genealogy, birth and infancy, and in John we have eighteen verses of prologue and a chapter of epilogue. About a third of all the space is given to the closing week. There are ninety chapters all told. But had the three years' ministry been written on the same scale as Passion week we should have had four thousand chapters. And had they been dealt with as fully as the day of crucifixion there would have been forty thousand chapters.

What does this perspective of the books teach us as to the purpose of their authors? Surely this: that they are not writing lives of Christ, but are presenting to us the Christ of the cross. Like Paul, they determined to know nothing but Jesus Christ *and Him crucified*.

The fact is that what we call the four Gospels are four presentations of the one gospel. And what is the gospel? Good news, is it not? Who ever in all the world's history heard better news than the disciples did the morning of the resurrection? Look at the facts, told as they are with



such charming simplicity. Jesus was dead and buried. Their hopes were buried with Him. They were in utmost sorrow, despondency and gloom all that dark Sabbath day. By the resurrection on the third day, they were begotten again to a living hope and an ecstatic joy. But while they rejoice in His return, they do not yet understand why He should have died. He tells them and from the Scriptures shows how He had first to suffer and afterward to enter into His glory. Through Moses and the prophets, He traces the wonderful story and how through His sacrifice it was made possible to proclaim repentance and remission of sins to all the nations. It would be simply impossible to pass by the great picture of the Suffering Servant of Jehovah. Rather must that have occupied the chief place in the exposition. This they are commissioned to preach and its importance must be confessed in baptism. In the gladness and glory of their new experience and in the power of the Holy Spirit, they begin their preaching on the day of Pentecost. They stand on resurrection ground and, looking back, behold in the foreground the figure of the crucified, now known to be the Sufferer of Isaiah. He who died and has risen fills the field of vision. They tell us just enough about Him to let us see His might and majesty; His wisdom and sinlessness, and then present Him on the cross bearing our sins, creating the gospel and making it possible to promise forgiveness to all who repent and believe. Peter is the leader and more than any other determines the form of presentation. Mark has put it in writing for us.

This is the gospel. Mark's title says so. It was so-called in Isaiah. Their experience gives reality to it. Paul chimes in with them exactly when in 1 Cor. 15:3 he tells us what the gospel is: that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried and that He has been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures". That Isaiah is among the Scriptures he has in mind, is indicated by his quotation in Romans

10:15. There is not the slightest hint of any difference of opinion on this point.

Matthew and Luke follow the same general lines as Mark, adding a considerable amount of teaching material. It may be that most of this was taken from a previous document containing sayings and discourses of Jesus. That supposed document has been reconstructed by Harnack and others, and, thinking of that and of Mark's Gospel, Harnack speaks of them as the twofold gospel. The title is quite unfortunate. Mark's is a presentation of the gospel of the Crucified, but Q (as the Logia document is now commonly called) is not the gospel. It is rather the ethical teaching of Jesus. It is law rather than gospel. If that were all that Jesus brought us—a perfecting of the law—He could never have done more for us than deepen our sense of sin. There would be no forgiveness of sin, no salvation for the sinner. He did in His life and teaching complete the law. But that would simply deepen our despair. In His death, however, He has made possible a forgiveness that meets the demand of conscience and in His resurrection our living authority and power today He communicates to the believer the life and spirit which makes the perfectly holy law of God a welcome guide to the aspiring soul and fills us with sure hope of ultimate likeness to Him, as in the energy of His Spirit we seek to imitate His example. That is the gospel, the glad tidings our hearts need. That is the gospel Mark undertakes to present. The title of his book is "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God". It is the gospel Peter preached on Pentecost, the one that Philip made known to the Ethiopian statesmen, the one that Paul proclaimed with such exultant certainty of its power, the one, too, which, in Gospel, Epistle, and Revelation, John presents as the manifestation of the love of God, the method by which Christ looses us from our sins in His own blood and makes us a Kingdom, priests unto God our Father.

## 4. The death of Jesus was

## MORE THAN A MARTYR'S DEATH.

If the death of Jesus was only the death of a martyr, then, with all reverence let it be said, He could not be considered the bravest of martyrs. Stephen, the first Christian martyr, went to death with happy heart and shining face. Others have faced beast or sword, flood or flame, with singing and gladness, counting it a joy to be counted worthy to suffer for His sake. But Jesus approached the cross with dread unutterable. No one can read carefully the account of His going up to Jerusalem without seeing that the shadow of the cross was upon Him, that the iron was entering His soul. Mark's graphic words reveal it (10:32): "They were on the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus was going before them: and they were amazed; and they that followed were afraid." These are strange words. There was something about His look and demeanor that struck the disciples with awe and others with fear. He walked ahead alone—a great soul in sorrow, seeking solitude. Presently, He gives the reason to the disciples and Mark passes it on to us. It was His approaching death. As He proceeds southward, the shadow deepens. The outward indications of it are a certain sternness, vehemence, almost impatience with men's sins, whether these be the ambitions of disciples, the calculations of would-be followers, the selfish pride and worldliness of religious leaders or the cunning of Herod Antipas. This dread of the cross reaches its climax in Gethsemane. There it becomes an agony that wrings the very blood from His veins. Dare we say that this was due to His fear of the physical torture that men would inflict? If it were, if there was nothing before Him in bodily or mental suffering essentially different from that which confronted a Stephen or a Latimer, it would be difficult to accord Him the chief place among those who have died in a good cause.

But the facts of the history are against such a supposition. Indeed, His physical sufferings are apparently



swallowed up and lost sight of in those of the soul. On the whole human plane He thinks of others rather than of Himself—the soldiers who nail Him to the cross, the penitent robber, His grief-stricken mother. It is only after the darkness and the awful experience through which He passed within those hours, that He seems to have become acutely conscious of physical suffering. It was then that He cried, “I thirst”. It was not that suffering He had been dreading so exceedingly. No. What He dreaded was that soul experience there on the cross in the darkness which drew from Him the agonized cry, “My God! My God! Why hast Thou forsaken me?”

There are depths in that experience which we may not fathom, mystery we cannot comprehend. But we should not for that reason deny it. We have been learning in our day and more and more these later years, not to come to nature or to God with pre-conceived theories as to what may or may not be possible, but to observe facts and adjust our theories to them. Here the fact is that the One on the cross was forsaken by the Father. It will not do with Professor Bacon to deny that Jesus ever uttered them, on the assumption that such a thing is impossible and unthinkable. On similar *a priori* grounds, many theologians have maintained that God could not suffer. Most of us today will agree with Dr. Mullins that He can, and feel drawn to Him all the more because of that. Nor will it do with others to say that He was not really forsaken, that He only imagined it—an hallucination due to extreme weakness and exhaustion. The record is against such an assumption. He was actually forsaken. He says so, and He was not mistaken. That furnishes an explanation for His overwhelming dread. Otherwise there is none sufficient. There was an actual rupture of the fellowship between the Father and the Son.

Observe how artlessly and, from the human side, how undesignedly the records, when taken together, reveal it. His first word from the cross, uttered probably when

they were driving the nails through His hand and feet, reveals the fact that His fellowship with the Father was still unbroken; and in the strength of that fellowship, He prays for those who crucify Him. But by and by, the darkness falls, the sun's light failing, and in the darkness that fellowship was ruptured. Hence the cry—not "My Father", but "My God". The fellowship between the Father and the Son for the first and last time was broken. That fellowship was His supreme joy in the ages before ever the world was. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God [*i. e.*, in face to face fellowship with God], and the Word was God." That Word was the only begotten God (Jno. 1:18). All through His earthly life, whatever men might do to Him, or however much He might suffer in soul through grief at their misdeeds, His fellowship with the Father was continuous and made glad His heart. That explains the peace of which He could speak the night of His betrayal. That was His very life. The rupture of it was soul death. The dread of it drew the bloody sweat in Gethsemane; the experience of it ruptured His heart on the cross. It was from that the sun hid his face; at that the earth quaked, as if the hand that upheld her was for the moment withdrawn. That passed with the darkness, and the restoration of fellowship is marked by the use of the word "Father" in the final word from the cross.

But the cry of distress tells us something more. While it tells us He was forsaken, it also tells us that He recognizes God, claims Him as His, and is conscious of having done nothing, personally, to meet such a doom. That consciousness persists amid all His desolation of soul. No suspicion of personal guilt smites His conscience. To the inquiry, couched in these terms, there can be only one answer, the answer given everywhere in the Scripture. "He bore our sins." "Him who knew no sin God made sin for us." "It pleased the Lord to bruise Him. He hath put Him to grief. He laid on Him the iniquity

of us all." "He gave Him to be the propitiation from our sins." "He was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." We may ask questions here which we cannot answer. But we can do that about anything. That is not a sufficient reason for rejecting the fact. It befits us to walk humbly and reverently. If we do and take all the facts into consideration, it will not be difficult to believe. Our wisdom is gratefully to accept the interpretation the risen Lord Himself has been pleased to give and rejoice in the salvation thus provided. We are face to face, not simply with the treatment of a man by men, but something infinitely more—a transaction within the godhead. Is it too much to say that in some sense death struck into deity? The rupture of our fellowship with God through sin means death; the rupture of that between the Father and the Son also means death. We are not to be thinking, as heathens may, of a heartless God in cold blood giving up a third person, an innocent one, to suffer for us men. It is God Himself taking from Himself the burden of the world's sin. The Trinity is active in this historic event. The Father gave up the Son for us all; the Son laid down His life for the sheep; at the same time it was "through the Eternal Spirit He offered Himself without spot unto God". This is the answer to the objection so often urged against the atonement in the name of ethics. The break in fellowship which broke the heart of the Son broke the Father's heart also. The Triune God is the Sufferer. Does anything less than this do justice to Paul's appeal to the elders of the Church at Ephesus—so startling to many today, so familiar probably to them—"Feed the *Church of God which He purchased with His own blood*"? Is this not what Watts means in the words we have so often sang:

"Forbid it, Lord, that I should boast

Save in the death of Christ, my God."

Many have shrunk from it and in their shrinking have changed the word "God" to "Lord", both in Paul and in Watts. Naturally enough; for, whenever the Unita-



rian conception obtains, such language becomes difficult if not impossible. Unitarianism always has difficulty with the scriptural doctrine of atonement. But it is simply another illustration of the narrowness of that creed with all its boast of breadth. It is not broad enough to make room for all the historic facts. Trinitarianism is; indeed, it has been created by the fact. And a glorious fact indeed is this we have been dealing with—that God Himself suffers for us in His great love and does everything on His side that can be done for our salvation. Thus we know beyond all peradventure that

“The love of God is broader  
Than the measure of man’s mind,  
And the heart of the Eternal  
Is most wonderfully kind.”

If our love were but more simply we should take Him at His Word. If Christ were only a man or only a messenger we could never be quite sure of God. Conceivably, something still would be left for God to do. But He has done all. Here is finality. Last of all, the Son, our Lord and our God.

Two further remarks before passing from this fourth point. I stated at the outset that there was something unique in Christ’s experience on the cross—something the like of which He never knew before and has never known since. That sixth utterance of His, “It is finished”, is a declaration to that effect. It undoubtedly refers to that soul death for us through which He had just passed, from which He has just emerged. That stands “*un fait accompli*”. It is the equivalent of Paul’s phrase, “He died unto sin *once for all*”. Now, back in fellowship with the Father as His final utterance from the cross reveals, “He liveth unto God”. It finds expression also in Hebrews 9:8: “Lo, Christ having been offered *once for all* to bear the sins of many.” John puts it in the Apocalypse: “I am He that liveth, and I became dead and behold I am alive forever and ever.”

That experience of death took place once for all. But

it reveals eternal facts, the facts of God's love and righteousness. Only in the latter sense is there any truth in the popular phrase, "An eternal atonement". The atonement took place while Christ hung on the cross. It is not going on now. Paul carefully uses past tense, not present, in 2 Corinthians 5:19, when he speaks of the atonement or the divine side of reconciliation. He always does, as in verse 18. For the human side he uses the present, as in verse 20. But the atonement revealed to us that love and righteousness of God which are eternal and are operative today. It also effects results which are eternal. It has made it possible for God righteously to forgive our sins and to pour into believing hearts the tides of His own life.

The other remark is this. Christ's death was more than a martyr's death. He died that martyrs might not die the kind of death He died. Through death He vanquished death, He abolished death. The martyr's death is death no longer. It is not separation from God, it is rather the entrance upon the fuller fellowship.

5. Let us notice in the fifth and last place

#### EXPRESS STATEMENTS IN THE GOSPELS.

The Gospels do not simply give us the narrative of the facts. They give us the interpretation. Here is one passage reported by both Mark and Matthew: "The Son of Man came not to be served but to serve and to give His life a ransom for (*ἀντὶ*) many." Professor Bacon cuts it out. Why? Just because he knows that it teaches substitution, that Jesus gave His life in our stead and thereby effected our deliverance. But it conflicts with his ethical feeling and therefore he believes Jesus could not have said it. Mark wrote it indeed; but he charges Mark with immoral crudity for so doing. He says he outdid Paul here. He apparently overlooks the fact that Matthew, too, agrees with Mark. The statement did not offend the ethical sense of Matthew or Mark or Paul. Indeed, they rejoiced in it as the gospel that alone was able to relieve

their sin-burdened consciences. And most of us feel as they did. What we have in Paul's Epistles is only a legitimate unfolding of this germinal statement of Jesus. Jesus said it. It is the ethic of God. We have had a surfeit of cutting and carving the New Testament to suit the ethical notions of men. German scholars have been past-masters at the practice. And this war has exposed the utter unreliability of their ethical sense.

We have also the words Jesus used at the institution of the Supper. "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many for the remission of sins." That certainly refers to His death. In keeping with this is that other saying: "I have a baptism to be baptized with." John's baptism was a repentance baptism for the remission of sins. The same phrase is used by Mark, in that connection, which Matthew reports Jesus as using at the Supper. The baptism Jesus had in mind was His death. That was for the remission of sins. He makes that quite clear in His words to the disciples after His resurrection. It is only by doing violence both to history and exegesis that we rob the Gospels of this testimony of the purpose of the death of Christ. The Master's own teaching is the germ of all that is found in the rest of the New Testament.

If one is asked why Jesus did not say more about it than He did, the answer is ready to hand. It was His custom first to do and then to teach. His teaching regularly grew out of His doing and explained it. That He left the full explanation until after His resurrection was in keeping with His practice, and His method is just one of many marks of His peerlessness as a teacher, as modern pedagogics testifies.

At the same time, we can see reason for His course. He told the disciples frequently about His death and resurrection, and they could not believe it. But He told them beforehand so that when it did occur they might see that He was not surprised and their faith might be helped. At the time, they could not believe that He would



die. There was little use at that stage in dwelling upon its significance, unless, indeed, it be in the hope that the seed thus planted might secretly germinate in their minds and prepare them the more readily for understanding the fuller exposition of those resurrection days.

Perhaps, too, in His mind and in the mind of the inspiring Spirit, it was intended beforehand to provide the answer to the people who have since ventured to make a cleavage between Jesus and His apostolic representatives. Certainly their preaching was in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. Theirs was the enthusiasm of a great gladdening conviction, and great multitudes hearkened and entered into their fellowship and joy. And history shows that just as Christians have clung to the New Testament presentation of the death of Christ and have preached it in the resurrection power, to which it opens the way, they have been blessed and made a blessing. Departure from it has always been a drift into darkness. It distils the dew of grace on the human spirit and generates the impulse to tell it out as the best news we know. The great hymns of the ages are instinct with it. Great preachers have caught their inspiration from it. It has been the mainspring of the great revivals that have blessed the world. Times of trial have usually driven us back to it. Wherever, and just in proportion as mere ethical teaching has supplanted this gospel, power has diminished, Christian impulse has weakened, joy has lessened, and morality itself has become discouraged and then defeated.

Our beloved and honored brother, Dr. Reuben Saillens, in speaking to the ministers of Paris a few years ago, condensed the truth into this striking utterance: "Christ died for us; that is the sum of religion. We must die with Him for our brethren; that is the sum of morality." It is not surprising that one who sums up his convictions in such words as these should be today France's most eloquent and powerful evangelist and the most winsome and effective pleader of her righteous cause.

## THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE OF JESUS.\*

BY PROFESSOR DAVID FOSTER ESTES, D. D., COLGATE UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, N. Y.

For many reasons the eschatological discourse of Jesus has received, as indeed it demands, the especial attention of students of the Gospels. The results of criticism, more or less fairly used vary from the acceptance of the discourse as actual teaching of Jesus reported with substantial and sufficient accuracy, through views that owing to the facts of misunderstanding on the part of His hearers and additions in the process of transmission only a part, larger or smaller, can be credited to the Master, to the conclusion that the whole is merely a pseudonymous apocalypse of the time, perhaps not even Christian but rather Jewish, in the origin of the primary kernel at least. It stands in each of the Synoptic Gospels, so that no commentator on any of the three can pass it by. Its apocalyptic form and content have always attracted attention, not to say incited controversy, and of late more than ever. The wide diversity of interpretations of the discourse as a whole and in detail even among expositors of the same school of thought, naturally stimulates additional interest.

In undertaking a fresh investigation of the teaching in this discourse, it does not seem necessary to preface it with any consideration of its authenticity, or any statement of the different theories of its origin and the arguments for them, since, however much our sense of its value may be influenced, the meaning of the language and the relation of the thoughts would not be modified by any theory but remains unaffected by them all. This is not to say that its authority and worth would not be markedly lessened, not to say wholly destroyed, did it not come

---

\*Copyright, 1918, D. F. Estes.

originally from the lips of Jesus, but the investigation of what is the real meaning of the words and figures stands as a matter of fact, and should carefully be kept, quite independent of the other question whether they originated with some unnamed fanatic, or, on the other hand, are, as the present writer is profoundly assured, a trustworthy report of the words of Him who "spoke as never man spoke". Exegesis has its laws of permanent validity: the principles and practice of interpretation are invariable, whatever the material to which they are applied or its origin and value. The first task in relation to the discourse, the foundation of all further study and sound critical conclusions, must be an attempt to get the exact course of thought and the correct meaning of the words, phrases, and figures which it contains.

The setting of the discourse is simple but striking and memorable. The time was the end of the great Day of Conflict in the Temple, the last Tuesday of our Lord's life. The day had really begun with Peter's recognition in the early morning of the great parabolic miracle of the blasting of the fruitless fig tree, emblematic of the fate of the Jewish nation even beyond the possible appreciation of the disciples at that time; it had culminated in the tremendous parable of the "Unfaithful Vineyard Dressers", who should not only lose the vineyard they had thought permanently their own but should also themselves miserably perish, and had ended, at least so far as public discourse was concerned, in the declaration that of all the mighty buildings which constituted that glorious temple, not one stone should be left on another. The Master seems then to have started down into the Kidron Valley and on up the slopes of Olivet on His way to His nightly refuge at Bethany. According to Mark, He was accompanied only by the two pairs of brothers, who not only were the first to join Him at His call by the Lake of Genesaret for His Galilean ministry, but also, as John seems to tell us, had been the first to join Him on His return



to the Jordan from the Temptation. It certainly was fitting that to those who had twice been the first disciples should be given the last message of teaching which Christ uttered outside the room of the Last Supper. Who would have been better prepared to comprehend it, and who would have had more attentive and tenacious minds to grasp and hold what must have been then in large part incomprehensible?

As the four disciples sat with Jesus, presumably in full view of the Temple crowning the opposite height so near and clear, resplendent with marble and gold, glorified it may well be supposed by the reflected splendor of the setting sun, it is not surprising that Peter voiced the question of all as to the time and the sign of the great catastrophe of which they had just been told. According to Mark, who is all but universally regarded as giving the most primitive and original report of all the evangelists, confirmed by Luke, who claimed to be the careful investigator and who is increasingly recognized as the accurate historian, the question went no further. Matthew, to be sure, adds in his report a second question as to the Parousia of Christ and "the consummation of the age". It is, however, most difficult to understand how Peter, who with his companions had as yet no conception at all that his Master was to be taken from them, could have spoken at this time of his "Parousia" in the sense of the "Second Advent", to use the convenient theological phrase which is now common and sufficiently correct, even though non-scriptural. It may, consequently, in harmony with the view now widely accepted that the reports do not invariably give us the identical words which were used, be tentatively held, in fullest confidence in the trustworthiness and divine authority of the New Testament, that the second part of the question as Matthew gives it, is due to the fact that the great thoughts of the Parousia and the Consummation find a place in the progress of the discourse which they could not have held in

the question of the disciples. At any rate, it is not decisive for the interpretation of the chapter whether Peter's question embraced the end of the world as well as the fall of Jerusalem or not. Certainly, the question of Peter leads the thought directly to the destruction of Jerusalem, in Matthew primarily to this, in Mark and Luke exclusively so. While of course the Master must be allowed to speak for Himself, yet unless and until constrained to another view by something in His answer, we ought to hold that the answer conformed to the question and related to the destruction of the Temple of which and of which only He had lately spoken, and which must have loomed up exclusively in their minds, must have loomed larger than anything which we are likely to reproduce in our thinking today.

As we read Mark and Luke, and Matthew in harmony with them, it is plain that there is in Christ's language no occasion to introduce into the first part of the Discourse any reference to the end of the world. He had been asked when His prediction of the destruction of the Temple would be fulfilled and what signs of it might be expected. For some time He does not touch the question of date at all but discusses events of uncertain duration which are to precede the great event which they certainly had in mind, since they had asked about it, and admonishes them as to their behavior in relation to it. It will not be necessary to examine in detail the first section of the discourse, since interpreters of all schools recognize that it contains an enumeration of events, or classes of events, which would not be strictly signs of the greater event to follow or preparatory to it, but at any rate must precede it. These events are (1) that false Messiahs will arise; (2) that there will be wars and calamities; (3) that the disciples of Christ will be persecuted, and (4) that the gospel will be everywhere proclaimed. In Matthew, the discussion of the persecution is expanded to include mention of its consequences in the cooling love

and slackening faith of some, and in Mark and Luke to include directions for the behavior of the followers of Jesus under arrest and a cheering promise of the aid of the Holy Spirit, yet the whole may still fairly be included under the head of persecution.

Now, in all this first section of the Discourse (Mt. 24:4-14; Mk. 13:5-13; Lk. 21:8-19), it should be at once recognized that there is no definite mention of anything which may not be found in the history of the period from 30 to 70 A. D. To be sure, the mention of the "end" in Matthew (verses 13, 14. Parallels will not regularly be cited), is taken by many to point to the final consummation, but with no sufficient reason. In verse 13, by the lack of the article the phrase is certainly shown to be adverbial and, consequently, may be sharply limited in reference, as it is, for example, in John 13:1, where "the end" was merely the end of the relation of Jesus to His disciples during His ministry. It is also to be noted that the marginal translation of the phrase of John in Revised Version, "to the uttermost", and Weymouth's similar rendering, "wholly", are as much to be taken into consideration here as there. As for "the end" (v. 14), it is to be remembered that the interpretation of the phrase is to be absolutely controlled by the context. It is a commonplace of exegesis that "'all' is seldom all", that is, that when all and similar words are employed, the reference is rarely absolutely universal but is limited, often very narrowly, by the subject under consideration. If it appears that Jesus is here definitely talking about the world history and its consummation, then "the end" is the end of that history, but if, on the other hand, as certainly in the reports of Mark and Luke, there has been no suggestion of anything beyond the catastrophe which Jesus had foretold as He left the Temple, then there is no justification for carrying the meaning beyond that. This is not for a moment to be thought of as an attempt to evade or obscure the teaching of Jesus; it is an at-



tempt, by careful use of the only basis for understanding Him which we possess, to find out just what He meant to say, no more as no less. It may be remarked that it is in some respects unfortunate that the interpretation of this Discourse has been so largely, we might almost say exclusively, based on the report in the First Gospel. In Synoptic criticism, the most reverent and believing as well as other, Mark is recognized as the most primitive of the evangelists in the presentation of his material. It is time that this idea filtered through into exegesis as well. If interpreters in general had begun their work with Mark instead of Matthew, much might have been gained. The reader of Mark has no basis at all for carrying the sense of "end" over to the end of the world, but must refer it to the period intervening between the time when Christ was speaking and the destruction of which He had spoken, and there is no sufficient ground for the reader of Matthew to do otherwise.

That events of the kinds predicted really occurred before the year 70 is, in general, familiar history. At least half a dozen earthquakes of importance are of record during this period. While in his brief story Josephus probably intentionally avoids speaking of any Messianic claims, by a comparison of his words with those of Gamaliel, Sharman (*Teaching of Jesus About the Future*, pp. 154-9) has shown that within twenty years, six or eight were probably to be classified as false Christs, while of course many more such claimants may have exerted an influence in circles too narrow for them to find a place in the world's history or even that of the nation as a whole. Insurrections, especially of Jewish factions against the Roman power, repeatedly occurred, and similarly there were in various places, as in Seleucia about 40 A. D., uprisings against the everywhere unpopular Jews. So far as calamities were concerned, the generation under consideration seems indeed to have had its full share. Persecutions of the disciples we know were, alas, too com-

mon, and doubtless the faith of many was affected. But was the gospel really preached in that generation? On this Morison remarks (*Comm. on Matthew*, p. 463): "*Shall be preached in all the world.* Not merely throughout the Roman empire, as Macknight and Dr. Samuel Clarke suppose, and as Dr. Adam Clarke all but concedes, but, far more extensively and literally, in every place where man is found, from the river to the ends of the earth, and from pole to pole." But such an assertion is absolutely and wholly without exegetical warrant. Paul thanks God that the faith of the Romans "is proclaimed in all the world", and speaks of the gospel having come to the Colossians "even as it is in all the world". With such examples of usage before us in inspired Scripture itself, it is unnecessary, it is impossible, to insist on pressing the phrase as it fell from the lips of Jesus talking to His disciples to the range which it might well have from the lips of a modern professor of geography lecturing to his students. The pedantic commentator is surely not as near the thought of Jesus as was the poetic instinct of Watts when he wrote:

"They to the farthest nations spread  
The grace of their ascended God";

and again,

"So when thy truth began its race,  
It touched and glanced on every land."

In false Messiahs, in wars and calamities, in persecutions, and in preaching as wide as their apprehension of the world in which they lived, it may well be said that the generation was not poor which spanned the space between Calvary and the fall of the doomed city.

While up to this point the tone of the discourse has been negative rather than positive, that the minds of the disciples are to be firm, unshaken, even untroubled, amid surrounding woes so distressful that Jesus called them "birthpangs", borrowing the name of the keenest suffering with which men were familiar, the converse now fol-

lows. When one event comes to pass, it is time to act, to act without the slightest hesitation or delay. This event is characterized in Mark (13:14) as "the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not", a form of description apparently more exact and certainly more awe-inspiring than has been previously used. (That Matthew adds the words "spoken of by Daniel the prophet", may mean no more than that he intends to give the origin of the characterization, at any rate it scarcely helps at all in interpretation.) A great variety of explanations have been proposed for this figurative expression. If we accept the most authoritative as well as the oldest explanation of its meaning, that given by Luke (21:20), "Jerusalem compassed with armies", then we may perhaps best think that when Jesus used the phrase, He had in mind the military standards of the Roman army, that, as Dr. W. N. Clarke says in his *Commentary on Mark*, "The phrase refers in some way to the Roman armies, half personified, perhaps, as indicated by the [masculine] participle—the desolating, insulting heathen power, with its abominations of false worship", and still more definitely to the military standards of the legions, each, 'as Dr. Broadus reminds us (*Comm. on Matthew*), "with its eagle of silver or bronze, and under that an imperial bust which the soldiers were accustomed to worship". It is not necessary to limit the accompanying phrase, "standing where he ought not" (Mt., "in the holy place"), to the Temple or even to actual presence within the walls of the city. That Luke refers to the same event as do the other Synoptic evangelists has indeed been questioned, but his agreement elsewhere is too close to allow in this passage the supposition that he diverges completely from his fellows. His varied form of statement must have been intended then not as quotation, but as explanation, a legitimate rewriting of the expression into a more intelligible and helpful form.

The words which follow, dealing with the horrors of the "tribulation", apply with great fitness to the siege



and sacking of the Holy City. To one fresh from reading Josephus, the declaration that there had not been "the like from the beginning of the creation which God created, and never shall be", hardly smacks of hyperbole. With this may well be compared the words which Jesus uttered amid His tears over the doomed city (Lk. 19:41-44). The accompanying assertion that this time of distress was providentially shortened need occasion no surprise, as many events combined so to hasten the capture of the city that Titus attributed victory to divine aid, thus giving remarkable confirmation to the declaration that God "shortened the days". Had it not been for the Providence of God the horrors of the siege might have been multiplied by their prolongation, and the conquerors infuriated by obstinate resistance might have made a clean sweep of the inhabitants of both city and land, "as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it and turning it upside down".

To be sure, interpreters have usually asserted that in some fashion or other Jesus has been thus far speaking not only of the destruction of Jerusalem, but also no less of the end of the world. For example, Gibson (*Gospel of Matthew, Exp. Bib.*, p. 341) says: "The Savior sees before Him with prophetic eye, not only that great event which was to be the end of the world which then was—the close of the dispensation of grace which had lasted two thousand years; but also the end of all things, when the last dispensation of grace—not for Israel alone, but for the whole world—shall have come to a close. Though these two events were to be separated from each other by a long interval of time, yet were they so closely related in their nature and issues that our Lord, having in view the needs of those who were to live in the new dispensation, could not speak of the one without also speaking of the other." But it is surprising (or would be if one did not know of what logical crimes interpreters may be guilty) to note that Dr. Gibson gives no justification whatever for this assertion, and that no good ground has ever

been found for it, that this view rests on assumption pure and simple. To be sure, many would positively assert that the fall of Jerusalem is a divinely given type of what shall be at the end of the world. Thus Gibson again (p. 343): "When we consider that one event is the type of the other, that one is as it were the miniature of the other, the same on a much smaller scale, we need not hesitate to apply the same language to both—it may be literally in the one case and figuratively in the other; or it may be in a subordinate sense in the one case, and in the fullest sense in the other; or it may be in precisely the same sense in both cases". This is important, if true, so important that no one should dare to assert it without good reasons. But where are these reasons? How does anybody know that in the fall of Jerusalem we have "a miniature" of the scenes at the end of the world? Where in the teaching of prophet, apostle, or Master is there one single declaration to that effect? The writer knows of no interpreter who has even attempted to give the slightest proof of this opinion. All is mere unsupported assertion, a sort of "tradition of men". So far from this being true, there is much in this discourse to show, not the likeness, but the positive unlikeness of the antecedents and consequences of the two events. Some have argued from the double form of the introductory question in Matthew, ignoring the possibility that Jesus may have discussed the two events not confusedly or even together, but separately, distinctly, and in order. (It may be noted in passing that the discourse should, if possible, be so interpreted as to avoid the confusion of thought which is sometimes attributed to Jesus and sometimes to His "blundering" reporters, though seldom to His blundering interpreters.) Others urge that "all" (Mk. 13:4), "end" (Mk. 13:7), and "all the nations" (Mt. 24:14) must be taken in an unlimited sense, but it has already been remarked that the scope of such words must always be sought in the context and their universality recognized as limited by it. It is

a sound principle of all interpretation of all literature, in the Bible and out of it as well, that in no human language inspired or uninspired is "double reference" possible, that is, nobody ever talks about two different things simultaneously and in the same sentence. If a speaker makes an assertion of one thing, he cannot thereby make the same assertion of a different object. Thus far in His discourse Jesus has said much which must refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, nothing has been said which might not have been said of events which preceded or accompanied that event, and nothing has appeared which would justify us in asserting that He was speaking of any later events.

In the next section of the Discourse (Mk. 13:21-23; Mt. 24:23-28), we have a renewed warning against false Messiahs. Morison strangely enough renders the Greek word *tote*, which introduces both reports, "thereafter", adding, "The word looks indefinitely forward from the period of the destruction of Jerusalem", and later, "in the time thenceforward". But invariable usage requires the opposite of this, that what follows this word should be simultaneous with what has been described, or, at any rate, closely consequent, so that the word must mean at that time or thereupon. Weymouth rightly renders it "at that time". It might well happen in those calamitous times that impostors should spring up who would claim to be the returning Messiah. Matthew alone adds to the prediction the warning of Jesus against supposing that His return would be private, for when He comes again the whole world will surely know it, a warning not out of place in dealing with the latest errors today. This thought is further confirmed by the different parabolic saying regarding the carcass and the eagles, of which no explanation is more simple or more closely related to the context than that of Mansel in the *Speaker's Commentary*: "As the eagles [better, vultures] are found wherever there is a carcass to prey on, so the judgment of Christ will come



wherever there are sinners to be judged, *i. e.*, over the whole world." Matthew, then, has introduced the thought of the Second Coming of Christ, but in a negative form only. In the positive progress of the Discourse, this thought has as yet found no place at all. Luke, indeed, does not speak of the return of Christ, but only of the ruin of Jerusalem, which is to continue until, as he puts it, "the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled". It is not important for our present purpose to discuss the various meanings which have been suggested for this most difficult phrase, for which Plummer in his commentary names six possible interpretations, as no conclusion on this point can affect the course of thought of the speaker. So far as His teaching are concerned, each report has thus far brought us to the siege and capture of the city, and no farther.

The next section is a veritable *crux interpretum*. In the few verses (Mt. 24:29-31; Mk. 13:24-28; Lk. 21:25-28), five things are foretold: (1) celestial disturbances, (2) the appearance of the sign of the Son of Man, (3) universal mourning, (4) the coming of the Son of Man, (5) the ingathering of the elect by His angels. Matthew mentions all these, Mark the first, fourth and fifth, Luke only the first and fourth. What are these events so strikingly foretold?

But before proceeding to discuss these predictions in detail, it will be best to notice the dating of them, for their occurrence is definitely dated by Jesus. To indicate their relation to what has preceded, Matthew uses the word *eutheōs*, a word invariably meaning "immediately", "at once". To be sure, attempts have been made to set aside this single natural, not to say single possible, meaning of the word by exegetical devices which condemn themselves by their own violence. Thus Schaff (in the *Popular Comm.*, following Lange) and a few others try to force upon the word the sense "swiftly", "suddenly", defining thus: "suddenly after a slow development, rather than immediately following or unexpectedly." But the

word cannot possibly mean this, not only because it never means this (no parallel is cited by anyone), but even if the usage could be justified, it would be so unnatural as to be impossible. The only idea which fits is that of relation of time, and not at all that of manner of occurrence. Not only does Matthew add "after the tribulation of those days", so that the connection is "immediately after", but Mark is also definite when he says "in those days, after that tribulation". Briggs (in his chapter on "The Apocalypse of Jesus" in *The Messiah of the Gospels*", p. 156) defines the word *eutheōs* as meaning: "It was near in the prophetic sense—that is, the event was certain, but the time uncertain", and he attempts an exegetical justification of this view by citing as parallel the Hebrew word *qārōb*, often used in Old Testament prophecy. But it is not generally conceded that the above sentence would make a satisfactory definition of the Hebrew word in question. Indeed, in Brown's great Hebrew Lexicon, in the preparation of which Briggs co-operated, there is no hint that the word can have such a meaning. But even if this definition were allowed for the Hebrew word, it would still be more than questionable whether this would justify us in giving offhand an absolutely unexampled meaning for *eutheōs* in this place, especially since it is paralleled by Mark's phrase "in those days", a phrase which cannot without unjustifiable violence be strained to signify a period of indefinite duration. If we do not have asserted in both Gospels a definite relation of time for this section with the preceding events, then words do not convey thought. Others, recognizing the only possible meaning of the words, insist that the positive assertion which they contain was due to ignorance on the part of Jesus or His disciples or both. Thus Plumptre in *Ellis-cott's Commentary* (p. 149) says: "He [Jesus], as truly man, and as having, therefore, vouchsafed to accept the limitations of knowledge incident to man's nature, speaks of the two events [the destruction of Jerusalem and the

“final” coming of the Son of Man] as poets and prophets speak of the far-off future. As men gazing from a distance see the glittering heights of two snow-crowned mountains apparently in close proximity, and take no account of the vast tract, it may be of very many miles, which lies between them; so it was that those whose thoughts must have been mainly moulded on this prediction, the apostles and their immediate disciples \* \* \* lived and died in the expectation that it was not far off.” This view Plumptre calls the “boldest”, “the truest and most reverential”. Its boldness may be admitted without argument, but unless the truest it can scarcely be admitted that it is the most reverential, and that it is not necessarily true and hence is most irreverent in substance, however reverent as well as poetical in form, the writer hopes to show. Perhaps, however, one more device for evading the natural force of the words should be cited. Morison (*Comm. on Matthew*, p. 478) quotes Calvin as saying: “Some interpreters commit the great mistake of referring *the tribulation of those days* to the destruction of those days”, and continues: “This great mistake is founded on an unwarrantably narrow view of the Savior’s aim in His discourse in general, and on an inappropriately microscopic way of peering toward telescopic objects. These objects would be necessarily dim to the disciples’ minds, not only in consequence of their absolute distance in time, but also in consequence of their relative distance from the immature conceptions and anticipations which they had formed. The Savior however had gone forward in His ‘second seeing’ from the scenes connected with the destruction of Jerusalem.” It will be observed that this is worse than begging the question: it is positively stealing the question and at the same time raising the cry of “Stop thief!” against everyone who protests against the theft. It has been shown that the “tribulation of those days” must refer to the destruction of Jerusalem. Now even if it is microscopic, “immedi-



ately" must be held to mean "at once", unless absolutely decisive exegetical reason is shown for giving it meaning without parallel in Greek usage, and it will be noticed that Morison offers no reasons at all for his assertion, good or even bad. What the dimness of the apostles' mind in consequence of immaturity has to do with the interpretation of what Jesus said to them must be left to conjecture, unless we use the thought to confirm the idea that the time word must be taken in its natural signification, because Jesus would be supposed to avoid an unnatural and so misleading use of language in addressing persons so immature.

If it is concluded that there is no meaning for *eutheōs* but "immediately", there still remains a choice among several explanations. We may hold that Jesus referred in what followed to His final coming, and erred in placing it immediately after the fall of Jerusalem; or we may hold that while He referred to His Parousia, the error of setting the early date was due, not to Jesus Himself, but to the apostles who misunderstood and consequently misreported Him, or, finally, the section may be interpreted as referring to events which did actually follow at once on the destruction of Jerusalem. Before attempting to decide whether the responsibility for error belongs to Jesus or to His disciples, great pains should be taken to scrutinize the section and see if the fact of any error at all is unmistakably demonstrated. Of the five predictions, viz.: (1) celestial disturbances, (2) the sign of the Son of Man, (3) world-wide mourning, (4) coming of the Son of Man, and (5) the ingathering of the elect, three at least may fairly, if indeed we should not say must necessarily, be interpreted of events which actually occurred in the first century.

It is common to interpret literally the phrases which speak of celestial disturbances. For example, Weiss (*Comm. on the New Testament*, v. I, pp. 209, 210) says: "In the grand pictures of the Old Testament prophets,

which now were to become literal realities, He described how after the terrors of those days, the destruction of the world would come. For when the lights of the heavens are extinguished, when the eternal stars, which look as though they were fastened to the firmament, are loosened from it, and in this way the powers of heaven which hitherto had constituted a well organized host of the heavens, rove about without any order or law, then the conditions of the present form of the world, as it came forth from the hand of the Creator, will be utterly changed, and the world is sure of destruction." Quite so, if that is what Jesus meant. But why suppose that the speech of Jesus was essentially unlike the speech of the prophets, so that what were only "pictures" when they spoke must become "literal realities" from His lips? Why not indeed the very opposite, and think that when the Prophet of Nazareth adopted the manner of speech of the prophets He used the language as they used it? If celestial disturbances were figures of speech when falling from the lips of Isaiah and his fellows, is it not at least antecedently probable that they were also figures of speech when Jesus employed the same phrases? To be sure, there more or less prevails, more, it may be feared, rather than less, an unreasoning prejudice in favor of literalism of interpretation. It seems to too many that to interpret literally is to interpret as the speaker meant it. So it has more than once been said to the writer that "if we take the language of Scripture literally, we cannot avoid" certain eschatological views. But that signifies nothing in reality. We have no more right to take figurative language literally than to take literal language figuratively. Literalizing is logically as erroneous and theologically as pernicious as is spiritualizing. The only thing to do is to ascertain as best we can how the speaker or writer meant his words to be taken and to take them so, taking literally the great amount of literal language which we find in Scripture, taking figuratively the great amount of figurative lan-

guage. Now all unconsciously Weiss has taught us how this language of Jesus is to be taken. He has reminded us that just such language is common in Hebrew prophecy. It might almost be said that celestial disturbances form an important part of the prophetic vocabulary. In Ezekiel (32:7, 8) we read: "I will cover the heavens, and make the stars thereof dark; I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give her light. All the bright lights of heaven will I make dark over thee, and set darkness upon thy land, saith the Lord Jehovah": in Amos (8:9), "And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord Jehovah, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day": in Isaiah (13:10), "The stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in its going forth, and the moon shall not cause its light to shine", and (34:4), "And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll; and all their host shall fade away, as a leaf fadeth from off the vine, and as a fading leaf from the fig-tree." These striking sentences are all used in connection with the fall of nations. Ezekiel is dealing with the downfall of Egypt, Amos of the northern kingdom of Israel, and Isaiah of Babylon and of little Idumea. All such figures in the prophets (with the possible exception of Joel 2:30, 31, which is of the same general nature) relate directly and solely to the downfall of a political unit. When a nation was destroyed, the stock figure was celestial disturbance. The explanation of such metaphorical language is not far to seek. In the *Life of A. B. Davidson* (p. 324) we read a tribute from a friend: "While walking one morning", he says, "in bright sunshine, the news of his sudden death reached me. It was as if a dark cloud had dimmed the brightness of the African sun." What the Scotchman with Occidental reserve put as a simile, the Hebrew with Oriental fervor would have put with the positiveness of a meta-

phor, sure that his readers or listeners would know that he was thus expressing in the most forceful way the terror and distress of the national calamity, never dreaming that anyone could be so prosaic as to take it, as modern commentators have, as bald literal prose. As Dr. Clarke in Dr. Hovey's *American Commentary* (*Mark*, p. 189) well says of those to whom these words were first addressed: "They would instantly perceive that it was the image of national overthrow, the extinguishing of the luminaries of heaven corresponding well to the destruction of all that is great and glorious in national life. They would never look for the fulfillment of this prediction in the realm of physical nature." In just the same way nowadays no one ever dreams of taking literally such a sentence as lately began an obituary of a distinguished Baptist leader, "A sturdy oak is fallen"; or the saying of the Thessalonian Jews, "those that have turned the world upside down", or the words of the Psalmist (14:1, 4):

"When Israel went forth out of Egypt, \* \* \*  
 The mountains skipped like rams,     、  
 The little hills like lambs."     、

If this still seems unnatural to any, let them take carefully into account the words of Dr. Hobart, touching in part this very point (*Key to the New Testament*, pp. 85, 86): "Now I am quite sure some of you will say, You are taking out of this all the reality, making the largest things in the book figurative. But this is not the case. These things are stated as they are because they are so large that nothing else will avail to express them. Figurative language does not belittle reality. \* \* \* How could he better tell it at that time than to use these figures in Matt. 24, in which the impression is that all things old are changed?" So that it may fairly be said that by the student familiar with prophetic parallels, the mention of celestial disturbances should be understood at once as denoting the downfall of the Jewish state and polity which followed hard upon the ruin of the city in those days.



It may be asserted with no less confidence that the fourth prediction according to the order of Matthew, "the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven" (Mark, "in clouds") was in the thought of Jesus as He spoke not His final return, but a spiritual coming. Let it be understood that the writer holds with absolute confidence the great truth which has been a part of the faith of the Church Universal in all ages, that He who "sitteth on the right hand of God" "shall come to judge the quick and the dead", as testified by the angels on Olivet. But it is no less true, and it is scarcely less important to recognize, that we are taught in the New Testament that there are spiritual comings to be expected as well as the final and personal return. Thus the coming of the Father and Son to the soul that loves (John 14:23) is not the Second Advent, but a spiritual coming. So it seems best to understand the promise to come and receive His own to Himself (John 14:3), and such certainly is the coming to the church to remove the candlestick out of its place (Rev. 2:5), not to mention many similar passages. Christian thought has unerringly grasped this conception of real but spiritual comings of the Lord, and it has been common to speak of Christ as "coming" to the soul with comfort, or to the church or community, in time of revival for example. Because we hold to the spiritual comings, there is no need, as unfortunately the manner of some is, to deny the literal, personal Second Advent, a denial which greatly lessens the usefulness of some late writings: because we hold to the final coming there is no need to deny or ignore the spiritual comings. Now only a few hours later Jesus said to the Sanhedrin: "Ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." That this refers not to the Second Advent but to the power of the Risen Christ in the affairs of men and church and nations is shown by the dating in both Matthew, "henceforth" (26:64), and Luke, "from now on" (22:69). If, as this Scripture tells us, from the

time at which He spoke Jesus should as much come in the clouds as sit at the right hand of the Father, then certainly that coming must be a spiritual coming. Then this coming may no less be thought of as not literal but spiritual in character. That this really is what Jesus meant is confirmed by the mention of clouds. Dr. Gilbert has called attention to a generally overlooked fact, saying: "There remains yet another consideration which affords strong proof of the proposition that the coming of the Son of Man did not always have reference to a particular historical event. \* \* \* In no case is the coming with clouds alone associated with a general judgment, and in no case is the coming with angels, whether with or without the accompaniment of clouds, disassociated from a general judgment. The coming with clouds is spoken of as falling within that generation (Mk. 14:62); the coming with angels is never said to lie within the life-time of those who heard Jesus." (*The Revelation of Jesus*, p. 317, 318). We may then hold that the coming of which He spoke was spiritual, for if the controlling influence to be steadily exerted by Jesus in the affairs of men could be called, as it was called by Himself in His answer to the high priest, a coming in the clouds of heaven, He certainly may well be thought to have thus designated the special manifestation of His power attendant and consequent upon the overthrow of Jerusalem and the uprooting of Judaism. Additional confirmation may be found in the parallel declaration (Mt. 14:28) that that generation should "see the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom", a declaration which must be interpreted as referring to the establishment of the church in a condition which, when contrasted with its feeble and despised beginnings would certainly be one of "power", as Mark calls it (9:1).

While it is fair to acknowledge that we do not find passages as clearly and helpfully parallel for the other predictions in this section of the discourse, it is no less fair to assert with emphasis that the figurative meaning justi-

fied and demanded for the disordered heavens and the coming Lord, justifies and in fact renders necessary similar figurative meaning for the associated predictions. For the sign of the Son of Man in heaven men have made the wildest conjectures of some physical fact such as Jesus refused during His life time here, but if we look deeper for spiritual realities, we may well accept the language of Plumptre (*Ellicott's Comm.*, I, p. 149): "The sign of the Son of Man is none other than the presence of the Son of Man Himself, coming in the clouds of heaven, in the ineffable glory of His majesty." The universal mourning may be best understood as referring to the distress which would result from Israel's rejection of the Messiah, a grief which need not be penitent. This is a scarcely at all hyperbolical expression of the sorrow which He whom they had rejected brought to the Jews in "every nation under heaven" in the destruction of Jerusalem. As the other predictions seem figurative, the ingathering of the elect from "the four winds" would most naturally be interpreted of the world-wide extension of the Kingdom in the multiplication of believers everywhere, and that angels were said to be instrumental in this work may be literal, teaching the activity of good spirits in the upbuilding of the Kingdom, or figurative, signifying the enlistment of all kinds of agencies in its service, messengers being a possible meaning as well as angels (cf. e. g., Lk. 7:24; 9:52). We conclude, then, that the whole section which is by both Mark and Matthew intimately related in time with the tribulation associated with the fall of Jerusalem may legitimately be interpreted of events in the first century, and as it can be otherwise interpreted only by doing violence to the Scripture, it follows that it should be thus interpreted.

The brief parable of the fig tree which followed is most naturally, if not, indeed, necessarily interpreted as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem. As a matter of fact, interpreters who have referred the previous section

to the Second Advent, yet with practical unanimity refer this section to the events of the first century, though hard put to it for a plausible explanation of the sudden shifting of the point of view with no notice whatever. The meaning of the parable is, in a word, as suggested by Luke, that in the beginning accomplishment of Christ's predictions will be a sure and final sign of the establishment in power of the Kingdom of God. To this is added the further assurance that before the men then living passed off the stage "all these things" should be performed, of which fact Jesus reassures them by an appeal to His infallibility as a teacher. That men then living should see all these things is, as Morison well says (*Comm. on Mt.*, p. 484): "A statement that has occasioned almost infinite perplexity to such as have not apprehended the reference of the expression *all these things* \* \* \* and who yet feel persuaded that Christ made no mistake." Attempts have been made to set aside the manifest meaning of Christ's words in two ways. Some have urged that the Greek word used, *genea*, may mean something else than generation as nation or race. But this is, of course, impossible in the face of constant and unvarying usage. As Dr. Eckman says (*When Christ Comes Again*, p. 65): "Without a theory to support, probably no one would ever think of calling 'this generation' anything but what it would naturally mean, the people living in the time when Christ was speaking." The other device is to modify the natural meaning of "all these things". This Morison, for example, does, even though he quotes Bishop Porteous as saying: "This is an unanswerable proof that everything our Lord has been saying in the preceding part of the chapter related principally \* \* \* to the destruction of Jerusalem, which did in reality happen before that generation passed away", and also these words of Bishop Newton: "It is to me a wonder how any man can refer part of the foregoing discussion to the destruction of Jerusalem, and part to the end of the world, when it is



said so positively here in the conclusion, *All these things shall be fulfilled in this generation*'. After a survey of the many endeavors of many interpreters, few of whom agree with each other, to set aside the natural meaning of these words of Jesus, it appears that we are bound to hold that He intended all the teachings and predictions in the Discourse thus far to apply to the men of that generation.

But it is equally unmistakable that the teaching in the remainder of the Discourse relates itself solely to the final coming of the Son of Man "to judge the quick and the dead", His Second Advent. The watershed, if so it may be styled, can only be found at the point of the marked antithesis between "these things" and "that day and hour", the former to be accomplished in that generation, while of the latter not even the Son knew and consequently He attempted no hint as to its date. That there is a sharp turn in the course of thought at this point appears plainly on sufficient study. First is to be noted the antithesis itself, an antithesis which we would certainly call unmistakable if it had not been mistaken so often and by so many. It needs no argument to prove that the consecutive use of "this" and "that" always marks contrast, and so that they must be taken to apply to different ideas. Let this principle be applied here. To be sure the effect of contrast is here somewhat lost because of the insertion of the declaration by Jesus of the certainty of the fulfilment of His predictions. Let it be noted that this sentence, although in itself most majestic and important, yet from the rhetorical standpoint is only a parenthesis, and may even be said to interrupt the connection between the contrasting clauses which precede and follow it, so that to see clearly their relation it must be omitted in our study for the moment. If it is thus passed over, the antithesis between "all these things" which have thus far been discussed and "that day and hour" stands out unmistakably. It is also to be noted that the phrase "that day" is almost a technical term for the day of the end

(cf. Mt. 7:22; Lk. 10:12; 1 Thess. 5:4; 2 Thess. 1:10; 2 Tim. 1:12, 18; 4:8). Fresh confirmation of this view is found when these two great divisions of the Discourse are carefully compared in reference to their tone and tenor. It has been seen that the first part of the chapter is full of detail: event after event is named. After this point is reached not a single event is named. In the first part of the chapter the disciples are bidden amid all the distresses to be untroubled, patient, confident, until at last they see the great sign for which they have been told to watch: then the one duty is flight to the mountains. Till the sign came quiet almost as of indifference is urged: as one watches the slow unfolding of the catkins of the willow when spring approaches, so they were to watch the gradual, significant unfolding of God's plan until the clock should strike the hour of doom for the once Holy City: then the spring to action, the hurried flight to the mountains. But after we reach the mention of "that day" there is no more talk of signs, no bidding watch intently the unfolding of events, no assurance that anything must intervene. We have no hint from the lips of Jesus of the likeness of the final end to the fall of Jerusalem, of which so many speak as if that thought came from the Master instead of from men. Instead, we are told that that day will dawn as dawned the day of the flood, without warning, without sign, without preliminary, just as other days, all other days, have dawned. The fact that the great end of all things should sometime come is positively asserted, but as to its date no hint was given, for none could be given: only the Father knew it.

Accordingly, though it is presented under various aspects, Jesus here prescribes for all His disciples in all the ages but one single unchanging duty. If the sure end of all things shall dawn thus unheralded, with no premonitions which might justify expectancy either of hastening or of tarrying, if none may know how late or how soon, He bids us all then to be always ready. The one supreme

and sufficient Christian duty in these relations, is forever preparedness. It is not surprising that the thought of the return of Christ developed in the hearts of the early Christians a temper which is described in the Epistles as expectant waiting: it is as little surprising that in all the ages loyal hearts and true, finding this world very evil or the Parousia very delightful to anticipate, have shared this temper: it is just as little surprising that some have emphasized this temper to the point of making it the ideal and duty for the disciple, but such is nowhere set out by the Master or His apostles as imperative duty. We may well believe that in this important Discourse Jesus measures out our duty to the full, and His only injunction is, Watch, by which He means just this, no less, no more. Be prepared. The words in which He clothes His commands would naturally from their derivation signify, be aroused from sleep, be alert, and so be ready for whatever shall come, but they contain no hint of anticipation or longing expectancy. That the thought which the etymology suggests (it ought continually to be remembered that derivation is not always a safe guide to meaning) is in reality the thought of Jesus is confirmed by study of the parables which follow in Mark and Matthew. The porter must always be ready to open the door, though as Dean Chadwick says (*Exp. Bib. on Mark*, p. 357): "To watch is not to gaze from the roof across the distant roads. It is to have girded loins and a kindled lamp; it is not measured by excited expectation, but by readiness." The householder should have been prepared for an attempt at burglary. The steward does his full duty when he rightly manages the family affairs, and the punishment threatened is for drunkenness and mismanagement. The maidens bidden to the wedding may well sleep if only they have a supply of oil for their lamps. The returning lord finds fully satisfactory and worthy of his praise the slaves who have been faithful to their trust, and the only condemnation is for him who had hidden his

talent and so was fatally unready for his accounting. So the one duty of the Christian in these relations is to do well the duty of the day and hour, and thus will the servant be fully ready when, unheralded as flashes the lightning athwart the sky, the Master comes to judge the world and reward the faithful.



## \*THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

BY REVEREND Z. T. CODY, D.D., GREENVILLE, S. C.

My simple purpose in these lectures is to seek for a little clearer idea of the work of the Holy Spirit as we find that work described and referred to in the pages of the New Testament. In this lecture I will discuss

### WHO THE HOLY SPIRIT IS.

Let us not go into the question of His personality or that of His relations to the other Persons of the Trinity. I take it for granted that we all accept the orthodox positions on these profound matters. My purpose now is to speak of the character of the Holy Spirit; and to show, if I can, that we can know what this character is. The very greatest practical difficulty that we have in understanding the work of the Holy Spirit, or in testing spiritual experiences and claims, is that our thoughts of Him are vague and uncertain. When we use or hear the name of Christ a definite and known character rises before the mind. All who hear that name see the same character. But when the name of the Holy Spirit is used no definite character is seen, or one sees one character and perhaps another sees something different. This may be true to some degree of every name, and especially of the great names of history and religion. But is it true of any other name quite to the same degree and extent as it is of the Holy Spirit?

This vagueness hangs over His work as it does over His character. It would help us to confess this over individual passages of Scripture. Take for instance that verse in Philippians in which the apostle gives the large

---

\*Gay Lectures for 1918.

continent outlines of the Christian religion: "For we are the circumcision who worship by the Spirit of God, who glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." We know fairly well what the two last clauses in the verse mean. The publican in the parable is a picture and illustration of what it is to "have no confidence in the flesh": and we can see him as clearly as we can the character of John the Baptist. We also know what it means to "glory in Christ Jesus". Men who stand in His merits need no interpreter for that clause. But who will tell us definitely what the apostle meant by "worship by the Spirit of God"? Where is the parable that pictures that great feature of our religion? All manner of large differences are found in the explanations given, and where one is confident that he has the idea of the apostle he does not seem to be able to convince others. Take another passage of the same import: "Pray in or by the Spirit." What is the characteristic of this kind of praying which distinguishes it? Is it praying where we do not use outward forms of worship? Is it intenseness of spirit in prayer? Is it ecstatic praying? Or is it praying with feeling rather than praying merely with the intellect? Or, to go no further, does it refer to prayer in the name of Christ? And if you are certain in your own mind, do you know any way to convince others? I could take many other passages as altars on which we could confess the confusion and indefiniteness of our conceptions as to the work of the Holy Spirit. But we all feel the truth of what I am saying. Is there any way to come to clearness? I do not know. But it would certainly help us to understand His work the better if we could get a more definite knowledge of the character of the Spirit, if we could see Him as we do Christ.

#### THE NEW TESTAMENT CERTAINTY.

This indefiniteness did not characterize the New Testament Christians. The work of the Holy Spirit with

them was an experience rather than a doctrine. The knowledge of this experience was so clear and common amongst them that all that was needed in speaking or writing about it was merely to refer to it. No description or discriminating explanation was needed. All understood. When Peter told Jerusalem that Cornelius had received the Holy Spirit he gave the most overwhelming of all possible testimony and it was testimony not wholly acceptable to his brethren. But there were no questions raised. In such an issue a mere reference of that kind could not now settle the dispute. A thousand questions would be raised. But it settled it then: and this indicates how perfectly definite was the conception of the Holy Spirit at that time and how common amongst Christians was this knowledge. This accounts for the fact that the New Testament abounds in references to the Spirit and His work, and that there are no discriminating discussions of these subjects. Everyone understood the mere references. We could wish that some of them had fallen into doubt and confusion. Then the apostle would have given them and us light on many of the questions that have arisen since.

Our Lord in His promise of the Holy Spirit said that His disciples would know Him. In fact, He took for granted that they would know Him in most of the promises concerning the Spirit, but in one place He stated plainly that they would know Him: "Even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive; for it beholdeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him; for he abideth with you and shall be in you." "Beholding" implies definite, differentiating knowledge. The first disciples certainly had this; but if we modern Christians have this clear knowledge, we at least need to be made to realize that we have it.

#### A NEW EXPERIENCE.

It will help us if we would recognize the fact that the experience of the Holy Spirit had its beginning with

Christianity. It began, so far as all but Christ Himself are concerned, with Pentecost. Before then it did not exist either in paganism, or in Judaism. For this we have the testimony of an apostle: On one occasion our Lord gave this promise: "He that believes on me, as said the Scripture, there shall flow out of his belly rivers of living waters." The Apostle John gave the following explanation of that promise: "But this he spake concerning the Spirit which they were about to receive who believed on him, for there was as yet no Spirit: for Jesus was not yet glorified." This does not, of course, mean that the Spirit was not in existence; nor, that He had not before that time done a religious work on men's minds and hearts. But it certainly does mean that the work henceforth by which the Spirit was to be known and which was to be His mark of distinction was a work that had not before existed. The Christian experience of the Holy Spirit was something new and to begin at Pentecost. This is borne out by all the promises of the Master to baptize His disciples on that occasion with the Spirit, and to bestow the gift of the Father. These promises all presuppose that the experience of Pentecost was new in human history and had no parallel in any other religion.

This is valuable because of what it excludes. For instance, it excludes ecstasy from any consideration as a distinguishing characteristic of the Holy Spirit. Religious ecstasy did not begin at Pentecost. We find it in Judaism from the days when King Saul fell down among the prophets until that day when old Simeon "came into the temple in the Spirit". Ecstasy also had a large place in pagan religions. I suppose this experience in which the spirit of man, seemingly possessed by a power other than self, supersedes the mental apparatus and takes possession of the man—this experience of ecstasy is as old, if not as universal, as religion itself. And because it is, because it did not begin at Pentecost, we cannot look on it as a distinguishing characteristic of the experience of



the Holy Spirit. But this is often done. There are those who think that there is no work of the Spirit apart from ecstasy; and that in its presence there are no other questions to be asked. And to think in this way is to identify Christianity with paganism; certainly, it does not lift it above Judaism. Ecstasy may accompany a work of the Holy Spirit. No one denies this. But it can accompany other spiritual experiences, worthy and unworthy. And on the other hand the experience of the Holy Spirit can be profound without ecstasy. We must look elsewhere if we would know Him whom Christ promised.

#### THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST.

We will come to a more definite conception of the Holy Spirit if we would always think of Him as the Spirit of Christ. And we can do this because our Savior identified, for all practical purposes, the Spirit with Himself. In His promise He said: "I will not leave you comfortless: I come to you." Evidently, He would come in the person of the Holy Spirit. To the same effect is the great promise of the commission: "And, lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." I could quote other passages, and will later. But it is certain that the apostles believed that the Spirit whom they received at Pentecost was the Spirit of Jesus the Christ. When this is properly considered it sheds a very clear light on the character of the Holy Spirit.

One thing is certain. We all know Jesus. Some Christians can describe His character with greater accuracy and beauty of diction than others; but when it comes to knowing that character, the humblest of us feel that we have it so well formed in our minds that we can pass judgments on what others say about it; that we could recognize it anywhere on earth we might see it, in whatever garb it might appear, and that we can select traits of it in others. The greatest achievement that Chris-

tianity has accomplished in society is that it has made the character of Jesus common knowledge. Nothing it has ever done for this world has quite equaled this. And when we come to think about it, this is nothing less than a perfectly wonderful achievement.

Now I call your attention to this: The Christ that we know so well is the Christ whose life was lived under the power of the Holy Spirit. At His baptism our Lord received the Holy Spirit, who after that great experience abode with Him. Before His baptism, our Lord did not have the Holy Spirit in the same sense that He did afterward, else there would hardly have been a call to tell us of the coming of the Spirit upon Him at that time. Before His baptism He had lived in the beauty and purity of His own perfect manhood; and when we think of His life after baptism we are accustomed to think of it as going straight on without a real change. But evidently there was a change. Not a change which followed repentance and regeneration, for these could have no place in that divine life; but there was a change in spiritual elevation and power, and in all that went with these. The Scriptures very clearly indicate this change. What I am pointing out, is that the life of Jesus that we know is that life He lived under the power of the Spirit, for all of His life after baptism, every hour of it, was under that power. The life previous to His baptism we do not know. The apostles themselves knew very little of it. But from the hour He stood by John's side in the waters of the Jordan on through all His wondrous career and divine work, He had without measure the Holy Spirit and all He did He did under His inspiration and power. What, therefore, we see in Him was the Holy Spirit living and acting, in grace and in power.

That indeed was a unique life, unique in every way, in its relation to God, in its consciousness of the Father, in its devotion to the will of God, in its elevation above temporal concern, in its perfect confidence and trust, in

its moral seriousness and spiritual elevation, in its lowly charity and service, in its indifference to human greatness, in its heights above human distinctions, and in its grandeur in the presence of all duties, those duties that called on Him to rebuke sin, those that plead for mercy, and those that laid on Him the sins of others. This earth has never seen anything else that is quite so distinct as the character of our Lord. The highest snow-capped peak of the Himalayas does not stand out against the moonlit sky of night so distinctly as that character stands out against the dull background of this world's sin and littleness. And what I would impress is this. It is the character of the Holy Spirit in exactly the same sense as it is the character of Jesus. If it was Jesus who lived it and wrought it out, it was in the full measure of the Holy Spirit He lived and did His work. If He wrought through the Spirit, the Spirit wrought through Him. As we see that life and character we cannot separate the Lord from the Spirit. If, therefore, we know Jesus, our Lord, we also know the Holy Spirit.

#### THE PENTECOST EXPERIENCE.

This will help us a little the better to understand the Pentecost experience and other occasions when it is said the Spirit fell on men in wondrous power. It has been said that the characteristic thing of these occasions was the speaking with tongues. Without doubt this wonder occurred, especially at Pentecost; but to fix the mind on this is to miss what was essential and see only the transitory. At Pentecost it was the Spirit of Christ who came on men, the Spirit in whom He had lived His life and the one who had made that life what it was—it was this Spirit who now came to reproduce in men the Jesus type of life. That was the chief thing that happened on Pentecost.

Those hundred and twenty disciples were turned each in his measure into something that had an essential like-

ness to Jesus. It appeared in their faces, in their spiritual elevation and joy, in their consciousness of nearness to God, in their love for men and especially for one another. In a marvelous way Jesus had returned to the earth. The men who came running together could see it. They had seen Jesus and knew His life. His character and manners and methods were all familiar to them. They now saw that character or life reappearing. When Peter told them, and told them without one word of proof, that Jesus was at the right hand of God and that it was He who had poured forth this which they see and hear, they did not question it. They could not question it because of what they themselves saw with their own eyes. They could not doubt that what they saw came from Jesus. And, therefore, again, this helps us in our far-off time to realize that if we know Jesus we can know Him who comes from Jesus to reproduce His good life among men.

#### THE SPIRIT OF REDEMPTION.

It might be said that the character of Jesus has never been reproduced. In its fullness, it is true, and in certain of its features it has appeared but once on this earth. But of the disciples of Jesus it is said that men took note of them "that they had been with Jesus". A real likeness had certainly been reproduced, and this in men who were weak and sinful.

The Spirit that came on them came as a redemptive power that tended to transform them into the image of Jesus. As a redemptive power this Spirit produced the confession of sin, the sense of unworthiness, the sense of guilt and the sense of pardon. Now it might be claimed, in view of what I have said, that not one particle of this was in Jesus of Galilee. On the contrary, the most distinct feature of His character was its sinlessness; nor did His clear consciousness contain a trace of the sense of guilt or unworthiness. How then can it be claimed that



the Spirit who came on men at Pentecost was the Spirit of Him who wrought so marvelously in Galilee?

The Galilee life of our Lord was not the whole of His life, nor did it manifest the whole of His character and work for men. After Galilee came Calvary, and after Calvary the empty tomb and the throne. Our Savior died for men in a sacrificial offering; He arose for their justification, and ascended to intercede for them and reign over them. These great redemptive transactions for men were a part of His life, entered into the completion or perfection of His character and became a part of that character which He shed forth on men through His Spirit. We are told in many places that the Holy Spirit could not come until our Lord was glorified. Without pretending to familiarity with divine mysteries, we may say that if the Holy Spirit was to bring the whole of Christ's character and work to His disciples, the Holy Spirit could not come until that character and work were complete, having passed through all redemptive experiences.

But it is evident that if the Spirit of Christ brought the redemptive work of the Savior to men He would reproduce in their hearts that which accorded with this redemptive work as well as moral likeness to Jesus. Where the molten metal has passed from under the stamp and seal, on one side will be the image of the cross and on the other the face of our Lord. This image of the cross is another test by which men can know the Holy Spirit and supplements the test of the Galilee character.

In the epistles of the Apostle Paul the Holy Spirit is more identified with the redemptive work of Jesus than with His elevated character. But it must not be supposed that there is any separation between the two. The apostle simply looks primarily on the cross side of the seal. But it is well to consider this great apostle's point of view on this subject, for it is an advance on what may be called the character point of view.

With him the redeeming work of Christ was taken, one might say, as the body of which the Holy Spirit was

the soul, or rather the life imparting power. Let me try to make myself clearer: There are three standpoints from which we can look at the redeeming work of Christ. First, we can see it as a series of historical events and facts, namely, our Savior's death, resurrection, ascension, and reign. Secondly, we can look on this redeeming work from the standpoint of doctrine and see the atonement, justification, sanctification, and eternal life. But there is a third point of view. The redemptive work of Christ is more than a series of facts which happened in a far-off time; it is more than a body of doctrines. These facts and doctrines are looked on as a living whole, eternally present in the church and world, imparting their life and spirit to all who believe them. From this point of view they are the Holy Spirit, or rather the very body of the Holy Spirit, that in which the Spirit has become incarnate and whose grace He imparts to believers. This, as I interpret him, is the standpoint of the Apostle Paul. To him, the cross of Christ was the living Christ, ever abiding in the world and in the hearts of believers with grace and power.

I will recall a few passages in which this conception seems to obtain. In more than one place the apostle speaks of the Holy Spirit in us as the Spirit that raised Christ from the dead and as the power of the resurrection at work within us. He speaks in another place of our dying with Christ's death and being raised with Him. These are peculiar conceptions, but in his faith the redemptive facts were a kind of living body or reality, and the power of the Spirit was incarnated in them and imparted them to us. We live in them and they live in us. Again, the Apostle Paul calls the Holy Spirit the Spirit of Grace and speaks of grace as a living power at work within us. He thus so completely identified the Holy Spirit with the redemptive work of Christ that the two have interchangeable names. Again, Dr. Denney calls attention to the fact that in the New Testament the whole

of the gospel of grace in us is referred to as the work of faith and also the whole of it is referred to as the work of the Holy Spirit (Gal. 5:5 and 2 Thess. 2:13). Faith is not one half and the Spirit the other. But each is synonymous with the whole gospel of grace. That is, this gospel looked at as something men must appropriate, is called faith; but looked at from the divine side, as the power by which this world is to be saved, it is the Holy Spirit. Here, again, the gospel of grace is the body, of which the Holy Spirit is the living power. And, again, the fruit of the cross and the fruit of the Spirit are identically one and the same in every particular. They are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, etc. It is the cross as a living reality in our hearts that produces these. But this is another way of saying that the Holy Spirit is the cross incarnated. When we see the cross we see Him. To be moved by it is to be moved by Him. In these passages, and more that I could recall, the great Apostle of the Cross so associates the Holy Spirit with the redemptive work of Christ as to make the two one. In that work, considered as a living unity, the Spirit makes His abode and in the Spirit that work becomes a transforming power in the hearts of men.

The simple point that I now make is that we can know the Spirit because we can know that work. We know what the effect of that work is on the man who believes it; we know what kind of feelings it inspires; we know what kind of worship it produces; we know its type of life among men; we know its humility before God; in short, we know the cross of Christ when we see it transferred to a human life; and because we do, we can know the Holy Spirit.

In conclusion, let me gather up what I have tried to say. I have pointed out first that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Jesus and reproduces His type of life and can now be known because we know that type of life: and then I have at length tried to show that in the epistles of

Paul He is identified with our Lord's redemptive work. (In the writings of the Apostle John, as we will see in the third lecture, He is identified with the risen and reigning Christ.) But I want you to feel that there is no conflict here.

One might say, "Of course, there is no conflict", and amplify his "of course" after this manner: "That the Holy Spirit was in Jesus and imparts His life, was in redemption and imparts its spirit; and also that He was in Mohammed and imparts all that is true in that religion; that the Holy Spirit is in science, in all movements for humanity, and in all that is true and beautiful wherever it can be found." Such a statement may have a grain of truth; but it certainly misses all I have been talking about this morning. If the Holy Spirit was *incarnated* in Jesus, He was not also in something else. When the Holy Spirit took Christ and Christ's work as the body in which He would forever make His abode, He limited Himself to that sphere as certainly as the Second Person of the Trinity limited Himself when He became incarnated in Jesus of Nazareth. Henceforth and forever what He did for other things could be done for them only as they are related to Christ and His redemption. If the Holy Spirit is incarnated in Christ and Christ's redemption, we cannot know Him anywhere else or in any other way than as we see that character and that redemption reproduced. But I have almost digressed. Let me return.

What I was saying is, that there is no conflict between the Holy Spirit's being incarnated in Christ and His being incarnated in Christ's redemptive work, and this is true because there is no difference between Christ and His redemptive work. Both are imparted in the one work of the Spirit; and it is by sharing in the redemptive work that men come to the likeness of that character which otherwise would be their despair. Here is the paradox of the Christian heart. It would seem that when the Spirit of the cross was imparted to a man he could have nothing but a sense of sin and would ever afterward



“stand afar off and beat upon his breast”. But as a matter of fact, when the cross of Christ takes its place in a man’s life, he indeed has a sense of sin, but he also goes down to his house justified. And this consciousness of restored fellowship with God, without taking away his altar unworthiness, enables him, in his measure, to live as Jesus did, with something of His fellowship with God. And of His devotion to God’s Kingdom. It is this two-fold kind of life, and not some other, whatever the other may be, that is of the Holy Spirit. “Hereby know we the Spirit of truth and the spirit of error.”

## THE RELATION OF ORGANIZED CHRISTIANITY TO THE RURAL SCHOOLS OF THE SOUTH.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BY RUFUS W. WEAVER, D. D., FEBRUARY 22, 1918, BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON RURAL SCHOOLS AND COUNTRY LIFE, HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN :

The honor of speaking before this distinguished body, gathered from many states for the purpose of discussing the needs of the rural school and for the promotion of country life, is one to be greatly esteemed. Honest speech and frankness you will surely interpret as indicative of personal appreciation. I have attended every session which has been held and I have made one observation which seems to me to be significant. We have sung many songs, ranging in sentiment from "Old Black Joe" to "The Star Spangled Banner", but we have united in no hymn of praise. No prayer has been offered. There has been no reference made to the Bible as a factor in the cultural development of the people. We have discussed nearly every building in the rural community except one, the country church meeting house. Apparently, the Christian religion has no part in the education of our American youth by the state. This conclusion surely is erroneous.

In contrast with the observation which I have made in regard to this Conference, I desire to present to you another one equally striking. It has been my privilege during the past twenty-five years to attend many religious assemblies, some of them representing a constituency numbering millions. I have heard practically every problem relative to the development of these Christian bodies freely and fully discussed except one. The mem-

bership of these denominations whose meetings I attended is overwhelmingly rural, yet during all these years I am not able to recall any serious discussion of the rural school as a factor in the development of the youth, and therefore possessing value and importance in its relation to the growth of the denomination. Apparently, these religious bodies did not recognize education by the state to be of any concern to them, though it is necessary to the cultural development of the children who are later to be the support of these churches. This inference certainly is not true.

These two observations, however, are significant. The one indicates that those who have in charge the program for the secular education of the American youth do not appreciate the assistance that they might receive in securing legislation, revenues and local support by gaining the active co-operation of the religious bodies which predominate in rural communities. The other observation reveals the fact that the various denominations whose membership is largely in the country have not awakened to the importance of the rural school as the one essential factor in the education of the children and therefore as the primary agency which makes for intelligence and strength in their future membership.

G. K. Chesterton tells us that the significant element in Browning's *Ring and Book* is that every man has a point of view distinctively his own. The value which you place upon the utterances of anyone depends upon your understanding his point of view. For this reason, I make the following personal references: I am a Southerner, a Tennessean, born in North Carolina, the son of a Confederate soldier, a Baptist, and a Democrat who is a little shaky upon the doctrine of states' rights. The national prohibition amendment which the Southern States will adopt is a violation of the ante-bellum interpretation of states' rights. We are not so enthusiastic over equal suffrage, but in our section of the country the papers are

accustomed to publish the pictures of local equal suffragists, and these pictures are becoming so numerous we anticipate the day when the majority of our women will be converted to the new theory of suffrage, and then, of course, we will gallantly grant all they desire.

The South is the nation's greatest rural section, and educationally the most backward. The problem of the rural school in the South is today a most difficult and discouraging one. It is a matter of gratification and pride that the leader in the national movement to aid rural schools is a Tennessean, whom Tennessee delights to honor. Dr. Claxton realizes the need for the improvement of the rural school because of his personal acquaintance with rural conditions during his boyhood in Bedford county, Tennessee; but I regret to report that, although the legislation due to his personal influence when he was a citizen of Tennessee has resulted in marked advance, last year the rural school term in that county was only five months, and the saddest part of it is that more than one-half of the counties of Tennessee had a term no longer.

There are three phases of the problem of the rural school in the South:

1. The geological phase.
2. The theological phase.
3. The methodological phase.

1. *The geological phase.* The productivity of the soil grows out of geological conditions. A limestone foundation produces blue grass, fat cattle, and a social order in which leisure and culture are natural results. But there are large areas of the South in which the soil is scanty and lacking in nutritive quality. It produces poor crops, poor homes and poor schools. The individualism of the South has led to the emphasizing of local self-government. The county or the school district is the school unit. Progressive communities are going forward; backward communities are making no progress at all.

2. *The theological phase.* Religion is a more important factor in the life of our people than in other sections



of this country. Theological controversies and debates still continue. The ministry is poorly paid, and I regret to say that a very large part of the country ministry is inadequately educated, untrained, and, therefore, unprogressive, with little or no appreciation of their responsibility in promoting the rural schools.

3. *The methodological phase.* The effort to improve these schools has been very largely that of niggardliness in the raising of revenues and an overemphasis upon methods which are practicable in progressive communities, but are not in backward communities. In my judgment, more important than the introduction of modern methods are the lengthening of the rural school term, the enforcement of the compulsory attendance law, and the securing of the co-operation of the ministry and the churches in the furtherance of the rural school.

The religious situation in the South is unique. Baptists and Methodists predominate in both races. There are 5,545,000 Baptists, 4,480,000 Methodists, making a total of 10,025,000 belonging to these two great religious bodies. The total population is about 34,000,000, and the rural population is approximately 24,600,000. Of this rural population, 29,000,000 or more are Baptists and Methodists in fact or in sentiment. Seventy-eight per cent of the country boys and girls in the South live in Baptist or Methodist homes, going, if they go at all, to Baptist and Methodist churches. There are 19,800 white Southern Methodist churches, of which 16,500 are rural, and of these 15,000 have once-a-month preaching and 11,000 are served by absentee pastors. The white Baptists have 24,800 churches, 20,000 of which are rural, 18,000 having preaching only once a month, and 16,500 served by absentee pastors. Eighty-two per cent of the white Baptist and white Southern Methodist churches are rural, while ninety per cent of these rural churches have only once-a-month preaching.

The most unprogressive religious condition in America exists in that section of the country where religion is

indigenous, earnest, and, in its doctrinal phases, vigorous. The development of these churches depends upon the development of the rural school. Until there is a large income, the rural churches will continue their present method of engaging preachers poorly prepared, whose ministry is limited to a visit once a month, when he preaches one or two sermons. The farming community must increase its productivity and must create a demand for better preaching. This can be accomplished only by the education of the children so that they will earn more and demand a preacher of a higher intellectual order. If the rural school does not provide education there will be no increase in the earning capacity and no development in the church life.

The Methodists and Baptists co-operated in securing South-wide prohibition. There was no formal union on promoting prohibition, but in all of the Methodist district conferences and in all of the Baptist associations time was given for the discussion of temperance, resolutions were passed, and the men who passed these resolutions voted for prohibition. These two growing bodies are beginning to appreciate the fact that Home Missions can accomplish very little unless the state meets its moral obligations in providing for the children of the South an adequate elementary education. I bring to you this message from Southern Methodists and Southern Baptists: "We are ready to promote the rural school as we have in the last fifteen years promoted South-wide prohibition."

However, we will never attain any marked results if the program for co-operation between the churches and the state in the interest of the rural school be made without giving our religious leaders an opportunity to discuss and approve it. The inspiration to take an interest in the rural school, in order that it may be active and effective, must come from the denomination's headquarters, and this interest must be given such prominence that it shall become a mark of denominational loyalty, so

that the church member's orthodoxy, whether Methodist, Baptist, or whatever his affiliation, will be tested by whether or not he is working for the promotion of the rural school. I am accustomed to say to our people that "an uneducated Baptist is an incomplete Baptist, a Baptist who does not believe in education is an unorthodox Baptist, and a Baptist who will not do anything to promote the rural school in his district is a heretical Baptist and ought to be converted from the error of his way."

The religious leaders of the South believe that they are competent advisers. The first demand that these leaders make is that the rural school term shall be lengthened so that sufficient time may be given for instruction. The lengthening of the rural school will guarantee better pay and better teachers. The successful enforcement of the compulsory attendance law requires the co-operation of all the religious bodies in the school district. Not only local sentiment must be in favor of its enforcement, but the churches must be ready to help take care of these families that need text-books, clothes, and food. The giving on the part of the nation to the state for the purpose of increasing the Equalization Fund now established in most of our Southern States will receive the support of the religious leaders.

However, in the tentative program<sup>1</sup> which has been presented, there is a matter concerning which there will be sharp division and probably open hostility on the part of the religious forces of the South. The granting of increased appropriations to state institutions by the state is making it increasingly difficult for our denominational schools to exist. If the national government makes further subsidy to these schools, however laudable the purpose, the probability is that these denominational schools

---

<sup>1</sup> A tentative plan by which \$140,000,000 shall be appropriated by Congress for rural schools, a large part of which is to be set apart as an annual appropriation to state universities and state normal schools on condition that these institutions furnish each year a definite number of trained rural school teachers.

will be destroyed. I have the honor of being the president of the Southern Baptist Education Association, representing 114 secondary schools and colleges. I speak for this body in suggesting a change in the plan. Grant to every volunteer who pledges himself to secure the preparation needed in order to teach in the rural school a national scholarship which may be made available for use in any institution whose course of study, standards of admission, requirements for graduation, faculty, and equipment come up to the demands of our Commissioner of Education. Let the scholarship be made available for use in any standard school, whether state, private, or denominational. In Tennessee, we have three normal schools. The enrollment last year was 3,580. Leaving out the four large cities, there are only 271 graduates from these normal schools teaching in the city and the rural elementary schools. State schools cannot furnish the teachers we need. In the business of preparing teachers, we ought to employ every plant that can turn out the product. This system of aiding the student to get an education would not involve any union between the church and the state, but would enable the national government materially to improve all schools by having a certain supervision over them.

The word "church" is variously used. Too often it is simply a punching bag on which some academic mind strengthens his excoriating muscles, and as his temperature rises and his attacks grow more violent, he sometimes commands the admiration of the onlookers. Sane men, however, form their judgments by the consideration of facts. The almost inconceivable nebulousness and invisibleness which so many call "the church" has had brought against it many an indictment, but the prosecutor has never been able to summon the body into court because when he reaches the concrete in religion he finds a definite social organization sometimes called a church but more frequently a denomination. It is the action of these



organized bodies which is subject properly to criticism. The inactivity of these bodies in promoting the rural school is due primarily to the fact that the friends of the rural school have not sought their co-operation.

As we contemplate the war and its effect upon the rural school and forecast the future of the rural school, permit me to say that the first step to be taken must be by those who are officially interested in the rural school. The Anti-Saloon League asked all of our religious bodies for the privilege of presenting their cause. Educators, realizing the normal obligation of the state to provide adequately for rural elementary schools should come before all of our religious bodies with a program to be approved and with a call to all religious interests to give hearty support, so that these denominations may work through local churches and these educators work through local rural schools for the accomplishment of the same end. The Church, and I am speaking now of all Christian denominations, will then recognize the moral obligation to promote the rural school, and when this obligation is accepted by the organized forces of Christianity in the South the rural schools will be made all that we hope.

The future of religion in the South is linked with the future of the rural school. Those of us who are devoted to the evangelical churches recognize that our great constituency in the South remains largely inert, ineffective, and therefore incapable of ever interpreting the truths for which we stand unless they have greater intelligence.

It is a mistake to conceive of the rural school as a local problem to be solved by local agencies. This Conference indicates that the nation is interested in each and every rural school. The principle that the strong must help the weak and that the rich must assist the poor commends itself to all of our Christian bodies. The legislation in most of our States has put the burden upon the local community with the result that rich communities have had abundance in the field of education, but the

masses of our country people have not had a sufficient school term to fit the children for the high school by the time they are twenty-one. Such a situation merits the consideration of Christian bodies and in the effort that you will put forth to aid the schools you will have the sympathy and the support of these great religious bodies who exist to further evangelical religion in the South.

## ADOPTION NOT IN THE BIBLE SALVATION.

BY W. A. JARREL, D.D., LL.D., DALLAS, TEXAS.

### I. THE INEXTRICABLE CONFUSION IN WHICH THE BELIEVERS IN ADOPTION ARE INVOLVED.

“The fathers regard adoption generally as the magical effect of baptism, and derive many illustrations of it from Roman jurisprudence. . . . The older Lutherans prefer to treat adoption in connection with baptism. . . . The Reformed theologians distinguish theoretically, though not practically, regeneration and adoption. . . . The Westminster Catechism defines adoption as the act of God’s grace, whereby we are received into the number, and have a right to all the privileges of the sons of God. . . .” (Richard Watson, *Theological Institutes*, Part II, Chap. 24, New York edition, p. 269). “Adoption is the second concomitant of justification, and is the act by which we who were alienated, enemies, disinherited, are made sons of God and heirs of eternal glory” (first edition of *Schaff-Herzog Ency*).

If the Baptists of 1646 believed in adoption, they did not mention it in the *Confession* of 1643 or 1646; but in the *Confession* of 1689 they said: “All those who are justified, God vouchsafed in and for the sake of His only Son, Jesus Christ, to make partakers of the grace of adoption; by which they are taken into the number of, and enjoy the liberties and privileges of children of God; have his name put upon them, receive the spirit of adoption, have access to the throne of grace with boldness; are enabled to cry Abba Father; are pitied, protected, provided for, and chastened by him, as a father; yet never cast off, but sealed, to the day of redemption, and inherit the promises, as everlasting salvation” (Chap. 12). If adoption does all this for us, what place is there in our salvation left for chapter eleven of the same con-

fession, wherein it says: "Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth. . . . by pardoning their sins, and by counting and accepting their persons as righteous"? Or, has an alien sinner all this and yet is dependent on adoption to make him a child of God and to be saved?

The New Hampshire Confession, drawn up about 1832 and now quite generally used as the Confession of American Baptists, avoids the self-contradiction of the *Confession* of 1689 by ignoring adoption. But, as anyone should see, its definition and explanation of regeneration and of the other elements of salvation are so comprehensive that they leave no necessity for adoption or room for it. In the Circular Letter, by Rev. Thomas Ustick, to the Philadelphia Association in 1786, he says: "The adoption into a family imports that previous to that transaction he did not bear the relation of a child in that family; and, therefore, could have no claim to the distinguishing name, peculiar titles, proper estates, or special interests of the family." But, in the name of common sense, all know this cannot be the case of a child that is already born into the family. This letter proceeds: "Spiritual adoption may be defined as the sovereign or authoritative act of God's grace, by which persons are translated into the family of God: and being made children are justly entitled to all the privileges of a divine and everlasting inheritance" (*Min. Phila. Ass.*, pp. 219, 220). But, I reply, inasmuch as God's children are spiritually *born* into His family, and birth involves all this, there is neither necessity nor room for this adoption.

Attempting to justify the lameness of adoption, the writer of this letter virtually repeats what a beloved, scholarly professor in one of our theological seminaries recently said to me: "No single term could answer the end fully expressing the nature of our salvation. Different phrases therefore are used to help our conceptions of those blessings, which are ineffable; and for the



perfect knowledge of which we must await, until the consummation in glory."

But to this, I reply that each term expressing salvation has its separate, distinct meaning and place, and cannot be left out without leaving out the essential element it expresses. For example, what can take the place of *born again*? what can take the place of *justification*? what can take the place of *forgiveness of sin*? Leaving out the new birth we are without either the divine nature or the place in God's family; leaving out forgiveness we are without God's feeling right toward us; leaving out justification, we are without the past life declared righteous by the Great Judge. But our being born again into God's family, justified and forgiven, etc., can be given no additional salvation by adoptions multiplied into infinity. Why confuse the subject of grace by the invention of unnecessary terms; and, then, further confuse it by the invention of apologies for the invented terms? Our own beloved, great theologian and seminary president says: "Faith is the condition of sonship. Adoption is the method of God for introducing sons into his family. . . . So also by adoption we are received into God's family by faith, with all the rights of the household. The act of adoption is, of course, accompanied by the act of regeneration" (*The Chr. Religion in Its Doc. Expression*, p. 407). But, I reply, "By birth, sons, being already introduced into the family as sons with all their rights and privileges, no infinite number of adoptions can render them more so."

Dr. A. H. Strong says: "The restoration to favor, viewed as the renewal of broken fellowship, is denominated reconciliation; viewed in its aspect as a renewal of the soul's true relation to God as a father, it is denominated adoption" (*Syst. Theol.*, last ed., p. 857). To this the reply is: Instead of adoption bringing "the soul's renewal to God as a father", the new birth does this. For the new birth not to do it would be as utterly impossible

as for the natural birth not to effect the relation of the natural child to its father. As we shall see further on, the Bible does not so much as hint at any adoption doing it. Andrew Fuller says: "If any sinner be now treated as a child of God, it is as an adopted alien, put among the children of God" (*Fuller's Works*, vol. I, p. 578). But this statement so utterly ignores or overlooks the place and the nature of the new birth that we are left by the new birth still alien sinners, on the road to hell. Equal to Fuller ignoring or overlooking the nature and the place of the new birth, to make room for adoption, is the following, quoted by *Webster's Dictionary* from a Bible dictionary: "The blessing brought by the fullness of Christ in the fullness of time is called adoption."

Robert Hall said: "It was not only justification . . . but adoption into the family of heaven, the privileges for all his believing people" (*Robert Hall's Works*, vol. 3, p. 502). In this, he utterly ignores or overlooks regeneration, the new birth, and forgiveness of sin, in effect, making his imaginary "adoption" stand for them all. Yet, no adoption ever changed the nature of the adopted. Testimonies to the confusion of writers can be easily multiplied. Like the confusion of writers on infant baptism, from its having no place in Christianity, so is the confusion of writers on adoption from its having no place in Christianity.

The confusion is only made worse by those who attempt to clear up the subject by telling us that adoption means that the soul is adopted now, but that the body awaits the resurrection for its adoption! As though the devil and the Lord were partnership owners of the Christian until the resurrection—the devil now owning the body and the Lord the soul! The Bible teaches that the bodies of Christians are now God's temple; and that they ought now to be fully consecrated to His service (1 Cor. 3:16; 6:15; Rom. 12:1). But all adoption advocates are driven logically to the position, from Rom. 8:23, that

God does not now own the body of the Christian; and that until it is adopted at the resurrection He cannot own it. This confusion of believers in adoption but illustrates Solomon's "The legs of the lame are not equal."

## II. WHAT IS THE MEANING OF ADOPTION?

The term adoption is from *adoptio*. Andrews, in his Latin and English lexicon, defines *adoptio* as follows: "A taking or receiving one in the place of a child." There were among ancient and modern nations several kinds of adoption. The advocates of adoption regard the definition in the Encyclopædic Dictionary as the only one suited to our subject. It is in harmony with the definition just taken from Andrew's Lexicon: "The act of taking a stranger into one's family as a son or daughter." Were it not true that Christians are all children of God by the faith that gives them the new birth the meaning of the words, *adopt*, *adoption*, would be very fit terms for our being "adopted sons of God". But as it never hath been heard since the world began that anyone ever adopted his own *born* child there is no possible place for the word adoption here. Adoption gave the adopted child all the privileges of sonship, including inheritance and name; the spiritual birth into God's family brings all that adoption gave or gives into the human family. By no means can the meaning of the word adoption be made to indicate the act by which the Christian has been made a part of the family of God.

## III. MEANING OF THE PASSAGES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN WHICH THE WORD "ADOPTION" IS FOUND.

The word "adoption" is found in the following passages: "Ye have received the spirit of adoption"; "waiting for our adoption, to-wit, the redemption of our body"; "whose is the adoption"; "that he might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adop-

tion of sons"; "foreordained us into the adoption of sons" (Rom. 8:15, 23; 9:4; Gal. 4:5; Eph. 1:5).

1. The word translated "adoption" does not signify "adoption". The word rendered "adoption" is *huiothesia*. This word is made of *titheemi* and *huios*. All the lexicons agree that the verb means to "place, set, lay", and such like meanings. Not a lexicon defines it to adopt, or by any definition that so much as hints at adoption. In not one of its 95 occurrences in the New Testament is there so much as a hint of adoption. Nowhere in the Septuagint does it so much as hint adoption. So, we can forever dismiss from our minds any thought of adopt or adoption from it. Yet, if "adoption" is not revealed in the verb, it is not revealed in the compound, because *titheemi* is the only part of the compound denoting the *action* or the *act*. No scholar will question this statement for a moment.

2. No scholar will dissent for a moment from the statement that *huios* no more expresses or implies adoption than does the English word "son" express or imply it.

3. Therefore, the certain conclusion is, as "adoption" is certainly in neither *titheemi* nor *huios*, it cannot be in them when they are compounded. The advocate of "adoption", therefore, having no involution of adoption into the evolution of *huiothesia*, can no more get "adoption" out of it than the infidel can get our moral nature out of an evolution in the absence of a previous involution. Or, than the sprinkling or pouring can be got out of *baptizo* in the absence of even so much as a hint of them, or of either of them, in its composition. Every scholar will agree to the proposition that the compounding of a word cannot put within it a meaning that none of the elements of the compound contained previously or independently of the compound.

Possibly, there are a few classical passages in which *titheemi* is used in expressing adoption when com-



pounded. But, if so, I have failed to find any example from the lexicons. It seems in a few cases in classical Greek to be used to express adoption; but these are with *pais* in some of its formations. And, even then, the expression itself does not mean adoption, but the adoption is to be inferred from the expression by the subject or its connection. But frequent classical examples of adoption are found expressed by some compound of *poieo* with *huios*, as in *huiopoieomai*, *huiopoiesis*, *huipoietos*; or, without compounding, in *huion poieisthai tina*. Even could an example or a few examples be found in any Greek that is outside of the New Testament in which *titheemi* in any of its compounds means adoption, or even if compounded in one case with *huion* it would only be the exception to the rule, and could not affect the argument of this article, for such example or examples would only show that the Greek, as other languages, sometimes has been misused—used in violation of its idiom or laws, or in variation from its well settled and common use.

But as we know the teaching of the Bible only by ascertaining the meaning of its words, there is nothing left for us but to conclude that there is no “adoption” in the Bible, but only in its English versions.

4. That “adoption is not in *huiiothesia*, agrees with the truth that our having been born again into the sonship with all its privileges plainly excludes any place or need of our being adopted into them. On the other hand, “adoption” denies that having been born sons entitles men to be recognized as sons, with all the privileges of that recognition.

5. What, then, do the Holy Scriptures that are translated “adoption” mean?

From the composition of *huiiothesia*, it must mean to put or set forth the saved as sons in some way. Young, in his concordance, defines this word as the “placing as a son”. The very part of the word in Rom. 4:17 is rendered, “I have made thee”. Of those in the church pre-

vious to having been "set", Paul, in 1 Cor. 12:28, says: "And God hath set in the church." In John 2:10, of the previously existing wine, it is said, "did set forth good wine". Remembering that the verb part is thus used in the New Testament, it is scripturally correct to say that we have been made sons; that we have received the spirit of having been made sons; that as sons we await the resurrection of our bodies as glorified bodies, to be manifested as a part of our sonship. It involves no confusion of doctrine or thought. These passages, in which *huiothesia* occurs, all involve the progressive setting forth or *manifestation* of the children of God, beginning with our having—as sons—received the spirit of sonship and completed in the resurrection (Rom. 8:15, 23). The following are some of the statements, confirming *huiothesia* as teaching the "manifestation of the sons of God" (Rom. 8:19)—the placing of the sons of God plainly before all intelligencies. President Edwards says: "This he calls the manifestation of the children of God, alluding to children's being brought forth to the light when they are born. This was to have its highest fulfillment at the resurrection, when they shall be born from the grave, and manifested in the most public manner in the proper glory of God's children, and shall receive the most public testimonies of God's fatherly love" (*Edwards' Works*, vol. 3, p. 552).

Julius Müller, of the sons of God, says: "In this life they wait for . . . the resurrection, when 'the manifestation of the sons of God' will be realized in all its fullness (Rom. 8:23, 19, 21)" (*Christain Doc. of Sin*, vol. 2, p. 304).

Of this manifestation, Tholuck remarks: "We have already the commencement of such state within us. . . . The inward experiences of the Christian even in this life, give him a certainty with respect to the glorification hereafter" (On Rom. 8:23).

In agreement with this, Neander explains the *huio-*

*thesia* as the "self-conscious appropriation of the filial relation of the sons of God".

Matthew Henry comments on Rom. 8:23: "This adoption is that *manifested* before all the world, angels and men."

The explanations of these and other writers of *huiothesia* demonstrate the fact that *adoption* is not in salvation. As we have seen, adoption does not signify "manifestation" of God's sons, but it means to make them sons, with all the privileges of sons, a thing that the new birth does. *Adoption* was put into the word of God by the Vulgate rendering *adoptio filiorum*, and copied by the English translators. Though he came out of Rome, Martin Luther alone, of all the reformers, got the rendering correct, and the late revision of his version lets his rendering stand.<sup>1</sup>

The conclusion of it all is: *huiothesia*, instead of being a usurpation of the new birth, is the setting forth or manifestation of the sons of God, beginning with the receiving of the filial spirit and completed in the manifestation of the sons of God in the resurrection of the mortal body into the condition of a glorified body with the entering into the glory of the blessed Christ in His second coming.

Thus declare the Scriptures: "We wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of His glory" (Philip 2:21). "And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the stars forever and forever" (Dan. 12:3). "Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth Him not" (Mal. 3:18). "Behold, now are we children of God, and it is not yet

---

<sup>1</sup> Rom. 8:15 Luther renders *kindlichen Geist*—filial spirit. Rom. 8:23 Luther renders *Kindshaft*—sonship. Rom. 9:4 he also renders *Kindshaft*—sonship. Gal. 4:5 he renders *Kindshaft*—sonship. Eph. 1:5 he renders *Kinshaft*—sonship. The words *kindlichen* and *Kindshaft* instead of the word "adoption", as in our English versions.

made manifest what we shall be. We know that if He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him" (1 John 3:2).

While in our present body, as Christians, we have to "mortify" its "deeds" to keep it "under" and to do this by the large measure of grace that enables us to "present" our "bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God". Compare Rom. 8:13; Col. 3:5; 1 Cor. 9:27; Rom. 12:1. In this contest we meet with many shameful but temporary defeats. Thus we are not fully like Him. But when we receive the full *effect* of redemption in the resurrection body, we will have bodies that will be as great a help to the soul as they are now hindrances. Then we will be perfectly like Christ. To the world, and too often to ourselves, we are now like the son, of a great Emperor. He now sleeps with the common soldiers, marches the dusty, hard marches of the common soldier—is so subject to the lot and the discipline of the common soldier that, were you to review the Emperor's troops, you would not know him from the sons of the rude peasantry. But wait till his time comes to be crowned the Emperor! The potentates of earth attend the coronation. Next morning the papers appear with great head lines, column after column, describing and narrating the great day. So the children of God, to a great extent, as the world or common peasantry, bear the hardships, the burdens of this fallen life. To the careless observer, they do not appear different from their comrades. But wait till the resurrection and the coronation day, in comparison with which the grandest of earthly coronation days dwindles into nothing! This is the day when the sons of God "shall shine as the brightness of the stars forever and forever". This is the day of which the apostle speaks when he says: "For the whole creation groaneth and travaileth together until now. And not only so, but ourselves also which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the setting forth as sons, the deliverance of our bodies" (Rom. 8:22, 23, 19).



CONCLUSION.

1. The subject as presented in this article harmonizes perfectly with regeneration as making us sons, instead of our being sons by adoption.

2. The subject as presented in this article simplifies the matter, avoiding the inextricable confusion of adoption.

3. The subject as presented by this article is sustained by the only New Testament meaning of *hwiothesia*, wrongly rendered adoption.

4. The subject as presented in this article restores the new birth to its place in salvation and sets forth the New Testament doctrine of the filial spirit and "manifestation of the sons of God".

5. The subject as presented in this article restores God's children from the non-family or non-blood *kinship*, that is inseparable from the position of an adopted child, to that of the divine *kinship*, family—*birth* nature of one begotten and born into the family, a relation infinitely higher than any adoption can possibly confer.

# BOOK REVIEWS

---

## I. PRACTICAL CHRISTIANITY AND HOMILETICS.

**The Oregon Missions: The Story of How the Line Was Run Between Canada and the United States.** By James W. Bashford, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York and Cincinnati, 1918. 311 pp. \$1.25 net.

One of the heroic romances of the growth of the United States is the acquisition of the northwestern section of our country. The great popular hero of that drama has for half a century been Marcus Whitman and the missions of the American Board have been accorded very great credit. Bishop Bashford became interested in this subject in his early ministry, toward forty years ago. He has evidently devoted much time to examination of the sources of information. In this book he undertakes to apportion the credit for our expansion into the Oregon country and to tell the exact facts concerning the boundary dispute with the British and the manner of its settlement. He gives to the Methodists the major credit and places Jason Lee, the Methodist missionary, quite above Marcus Whitman in contributing to the winning of this great section of our country. And, in the main, the credit would seem to be rightly apportioned, according to the documents, although there are places where one feels that another interpretation could be given to facts and where further documents were available and should have been used for whatever confirmation or modification they would render.

Dr. Bashford distributes the credit among the Indians, the British and the American governments, the heroic pioneers, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Methodist, Congregational and Presbyterian Churches. Of all these, it is easy to see he desires us to understand the Methodist Church should have first place. Through it all, he undertakes, in the end, to trace the clear course of God's providence.

The Bishop tries very hard to treat the operations of Catholics, Methodists and Congregationalist-Presbyterians as primarily and consistently missionary undertakings in behalf of the Indians. He argues at length that nothing could have been done to Christianize and civilize the Indians that was not done. If this is true, it would still be better frankly to confess the fact that whatever motives may have originated these missions, nearly all their efforts were directed to the material

and political development of the country for the whites. There is something pathetic in the self-delusion with which men like Lee, a few of them, went on to the end trying to keep the salvation of the Indians uppermost in thought and effort and really persuading themselves that they were doing so, while it is evident they are giving time, thought and money mainly to building up a white civilization. This was a most worthy undertaking. It was the more prophetic course. It may well have been the inevitable course. There is no end to be served now in failing to interpret it frankly. Jason Lee and his fellow missionaries are quite excusable for their failure to understand just what they were doing; but at this later date there is no reason why we should try to keep up the delusion.

The Bishop is entirely too generous in his efforts to modify the condemnation that falls upon the Catholic priests who, on his own reluctant admission, countenanced the lustful and murderous barbarities of the savages against Protestant missionaries and settlers. Even more surprising is the way in which he allows the old anti-slavery, South-hating prejudices, now a full half century out of date, distort his judgment and embitter his sentences. While tracing out in minute detail the hand of God in the winning of the Oregon northwest, he can see only infamy and disgrace in our acquiring all the great southwest section, all west of the Mississippi and south of Missouri, Utah and Washington. Such bias in one of Bishop Bashford's standing is very disappointing. He goes out of his way to display hatred toward the South and Southern leaders of half a century ago because of slavery.

Taken as a whole, the work deals with one of the most thrilling chapters of our American history and handles its materials with careful effort to set forth the main facts—always in a way to glorify his own church. It is a fascinating piece of historical research work.

W. O. CARVER.

**The Experiment of Faith.** By Charles Fiske. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1918. 180 pp. \$1.00 net.

The author tells us in the Foreword that when about to preach a series of sermons in a collegiate town, one of the students, in response to inquiry as to a suitable message, replied, "Preach on anything except the war; we have been 'fed up' on that." The students wanted "straight Christianity", as they expressed it. The volume before us contains the series of sermons delivered to these students. The sermons are by no means destitute of references to the war, but the emphasis is upon reality in religion. There are fifteen addresses on

such topics as the following: The Ultimate Test; The Average Man's Religion; The Forgotten God; A Radiating Gospel; The Essence of Prayer; The Unveiling of Deity; The Fact of Immortality; the Demand for Reality.

The author insists upon vital faith in Christ as the essential element in the Christian life: "Faith is not mere intellectual assent; it is the consent of the whole man (mind, conscience, heart, will) to the will of God as revealed in Jesus Christ." That vital faith requires an expression in doctrinal belief is made very plain. "We believe it to be practically impossible to maintain for long the moral beauty of the Christian character without its doctrinal basis. Is not militant Prussia the natural fruit of hybrid Christianity with a dash of Nietzsche thrown in?" Again,, "The doctrines of Christianity are the logical exponents of its facts and the facts are the basis of its life."

Writing on the subject, "The Joyous Yea", the author says: "Let us have anything, therefore—anything in the world—but good-natured toleration. Let it be a sharp nay if it must. If we do believe, even a little bit, let it be a joyous yea; a yea so sure of the truth to which it gives its glad assent that it expects out of it new experience and fuller life" (p. 73-74).

As to the Virgin Birth of Christ, the author holds that our experience of Christ's deity in our redemptive experience of his power prepares us to accept the Virgin Birth as a natural and reasonable explanation of how the divine and eternal Son could enter the world in human form.

This book will prove a strong stimulus to the faith of Christians and a very great help to the earnest and intelligent inquirer who desires practical guidance on the greatest concerns of the soul.

E. Y. MULLINS.

**Ornamented Orthodoxy: Studies in Christian Constancy.** By Edgar DeWitt Jones, D.D. Introduction by Prof. Arthur S. Hoyt, D.D., LL.D. New York: Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co. 221 pp.

The author of these sermons succeeded R. J. Campbell as pastor of the City Temple, London, being called to that position from a small western city in the United States. These sermons are brief, and not ambitious either in thought or style; but singularly clear, vital and spiritual, and most felicitous in illustration.

In one instance there seems to be a disappointing lack of clearness in the exposition of the meaning of the text. I refer to the fourteenth sermon, on the text: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs", etc. The author tells us clearly what it does not mean, but leaves, it seems



to me, the positive meaning obscure. But that is exceptional. It is not apparent why the title, "Ornamented Orthodoxy", should have been chosen for the volume.

C. S. GARDNER.

**The Joyful Hours of Jesus.** By J. Gibson Lowrie, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1918. 203 pp. \$1.25.

Fourteen happy sermons constitute a volume out of the ordinary. The spiritual note is struck that gave Jesus joy while on earth. In these days of gloom one can find comfort in communing with Christ. He was the man of sorrows, yes, and of joy as well.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**Higher Living.** By Smith Baker, M. D. Boston, Sherman, French & Company, 1917. x-404 pp. \$1.75.

Books that undertake to show wayward and weak human nature through life's maze of doubts, difficulties and dangers are numerous and usually valueless. Occasionally one like "The Simple Life" strikes a popular chord and is a success. The volume under review ought to belong to this class. The ideal of living set forth is really "the higher life", the phases of life which are considered are the main points where success is achieved or shipwreck is made. The thought is sane, balanced and delicate; the style is beautiful and poetic. The author is a physician of sincere piety, sound Christian principles and genuine delicacy of feeling. So far as the reviewer can see, this book ought to prove interesting and exceedingly suggestive and stimulating to all readers.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

**Salvation.** By Lewis Sperry Chafer. New York, Charles C. Cook. 138 pp. 75 cts.

The purpose of this book is evangelistic, but it is that kind of evangelism which has teaching as well. Chapter I treats of the word Salvation in a scholarly way and at the same time one can feel the preacher's appeal first to the lost that they may find Christ and then to the believers, that they may live Christ. Logically following upon this Repentance, Faith, Grace, Assurance, Security are discussed. The book closes with an earnest appeal to all classes. One could wish that many might read this book.

H. C. WAYMAN.

**The Sunday School Teacher Magnified.** By J. B. Tidwell, D.D., author of "The Bible Book by Book", etc. New York: Chicago, Fleming H. Revell Company. 143 pp.

This is a well written discussion, which must make the Sunday school teacher who reads it more sensible of the magnitude and importance of his task. And it will also help him to perform that task worthily. Under such chapter headings as The Sunday School Teacher's Incomparable Model; The Sunday School Teacher's Incomparable Preparation; The Sunday School Teacher's Incomparable Subject of Instruction; The Sunday School Teacher's Incomparable View of the Pupil; The Sunday School Teacher's Incomparable Rewards, the work of the teacher is presented in ways to make a person even of dull sensibilities, if engaged in this great task, conscious of the dignity and glory of his function. The analysis of the material is admirable, and renders it especially easy to grasp and remember.

C. S. GARDNER.

## II. BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

**A Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Thessalonians.** By Rev. Alfred Plummer, D. D. Robert Scott, Paternoster Row, London, 1918. 116 pp. 4s, 6d.

What a delight this book is. In spite of the new and able commentaries on the Thessalonian Epistles by Milligan and Frame, there is room for this one by the prince of New Testament commentators. Dr. Plummer has a way all his own and combines the most accurate grammatical knowledge with a thorough mastery of the history and theology and, in particular, a wonderful sureness of touch that goes right at the heart of the problem. His comments clarify the situation and start one's mind a-going in all directions. It is good to know that his commentary on Second Thessalonians is already completed and is on the market. The war has not put a stop to the activities of this great scholar, and the whole world is his debtor. The present volume, like his Matthew and his Luke, tempt one to read right on without ever stopping. There is no dullness in Dr. Plummer's scholarship, but the keenest interest and zest. He accepts A. D. 51 as the probable date.

A.T.ROBERTSON.

**The Modern Conflict Over the Bible in Synthesis and Comparison.** By Rev. G. W. McPherson, Yonkers, N. Y. 50 cts.

The two main themes of the book are the Deity of Jesus Christ and the Inspiration of the Bible. And no one acquainted with current

religious views and discussions will hesitate for a moment to pronounce these two the crucial religious questions of the hour. Connected with these and growing out of them are several other questions which are discussed by the author, but they are subsidiary and relatively less important.

The general plan of the author is to set forth the views of the new theology with clearness, state the causes which have produced such opinions and then combat the same from Scripture and reason. Resort is also had to epithet and denunciation. To the author the new theology is a hellish apostasy, dangerous to both morals and religion.

The little volume is evangelical, vigorous, often scathing. It hardly undertakes to meet the new theology on its own ground, but rather sets up a scriptural argument over against the views of the modern theologians. The author is familiar with the letter of the Scriptures, but often uses it with little perspective. He is obviously not at home in the technicalities of Biblical Criticism, and his argument would have little weight with the critics and theologians; but it will strike a popular chord and help to save the faith of many people.

Not infrequently there is a tone of vituperation which one can but regret. The author is indignant and his indignation often burns with a hot and lurid flame. On the whole, one wonders whether such a book will do more good than harm. It has much that is true and good, it means to be faithful with the evangelical position, it seeks to save the sinking ship; but it is so out of sympathy with the culture of our day and its modes of thought that there is danger that cultured people will be driven away. Is there no better way to defend and propagate the evangelical faith? W. J. McGLOTHLIN.

**The Shorter Bible: The New Testament**, Translated and Arranged by Charles Foster Kent, Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University, with the collaboration of Charles Cutler Torrey, Professor of Semitic Languages in Yale University; Henry A. Sherman, Head of the Department of Religious Literature of Charles Scribner's Sons; Frederick Harris, Senior Secretary of the Publication Department of the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations; Ethel Cutler, Religious Work Secretary of the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association. New York, 1918, Chas. Scribner's Sons. xix-[-305 pp. \$1.00 net.

"The Shorter Bible does not aim to take the place of the complete text or of the time-honored versions, but simply to single out and set in logical and as far as possible in chronological order those parts of the Bible which are of vital interest and practical value to the present age." Thus far from the preface. Of shorter Bibles there have been many, of various value. This is not one more such as we have already,

designed for children. It represents a new departure. Assuming that about one-third of the New Testament and two-thirds of the Old Testament play no vital part in the history or present practical teaching and function of Christianity, this Bible boldly omits the sections not of "vital interest or practical value to the present age". Again, the order and arrangement as found in the accepted Bible were determined by considerations growing out of ancient conditions. This Bible boldly ignores these and follows an order and effects an arrangement more fitted, in the judgment of the editors, to our own time. The life of Jesus and his teachings are separated, ostensibly, although such separation is rationally impossible and the effort to do so results in a most unsatisfactory presentation of both.

The chief editor is a well-known leader of the radical school of Biblical Criticism and the notions of that school have manifestly played large part in the selections and omissions, as in the arrangement and the paragraph divisions and headings with which the work is supplied. 2 and 3 John, Jude, Titus are wholly omitted. The Epistles of Peter and James, Hebrews, and all John's writings except brief paragraphs are grouped at the end of the volume under the heading, "Later Writings". There is no explanation, but it is, of course, intended to imply that these are not apostolic productions.

There are also numerous omissions which the informed reader will see at once are determined by the theological and critical bias of the editors. The argument of the Epistles is frequently quite destroyed by the omissions.

The upshot of the matter is that we have here what may well be a most useful selection of Bible readings, but one that will prove very detrimental to any full knowledge of the Scriptures in whatever measure it is used to substitute the New Testament in full. (The Old Testament is not yet published.) The new principle on which it is made does not commend itself to this writer. Mrs. Robertson's **Heart of the Bible** is better. Personally, I have never taken much stock in abbreviated Bibles, but have recognized their great value for young readers.

The collaboration of secretaries of the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. in the production of this "Shorter Bible" arouses a fear that there will be an effort to make this the Bible for use in the classes of these associations. Such use would be deplorable. The radical critics have been very shrewd in their propaganda and in efforts to introduce their views into the teaching agencies of Christianity. This may well be a move that will hinder knowledge of the Bible rather than help it. All depends upon how it is used.

W. O. CARVER.



**The Mystery Religions and the New Testament.** By Henry C. Sheldon. 1918, The Abingdon Press, Cincinnati and New York. 153 pp. 50 cts.

A good handbook on this subject was needed, and Professor Sheldon has provided it. The larger work of Kennedy, *St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions*, is beyond the reach of many who will welcome the clear and forceful discussion in this volume. The author shows that it is overstraining the language of the New Testament to read sacramentalism in it.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**Christ's Coming Again.** By Thomas Voaden, Author of "Christianity and Socialism". McClelland, Goodchild and Stewart, Toronto, 1918. 279 pp.

In this book there is much to commend. The objections to modern pre-millenarianism are forcefully and, on the whole, fairly stated, and the whole book is infused with a moral earnestness and a zeal for individual and social betterment which is tonic. Its effectiveness will be marred for many by the author's contention that we have no promise of any coming of Christ other than His spiritual comings. To reach this end, much of Christ's teaching is reinterpreted, the parables of the "Marriage Feast" and the "Ten Virgins", for example, are understood as wholly fulfilled in the history of times like our own, and the teaching of Jesus as to the Judgment (Matt. 25) is also applied to every generation of men, having no application to a general judgment. But while the attempt is made by such reinterpretation to maintain the continued trustworthiness of the words of Jesus, no similar attempt is made to save Paul's face: on the contrary, his teaching is frankly set aside as an error which he shared with other men of his time. This leads the author to a discussion as to the authority of Scripture and of what it is left to Christians if such a view of its errors is accepted, a discussion which, of course, lies wholly outside the natural course of thought of the book. It may not be surprising that the over-literalizing now so prevalent on the part of present-day pre-millennialists and the nature of some of the ideas which are so positively attributed to some of the writers of the Bible should lead in turn to an over-spiritualizing in interpretation and to a reaction toward a different view of the trustworthiness of Scripture, of both of which this book is an example. But however natural, not to say inevitable, this situation, it is none the less sad: two errors never make even one truth, but always remain two errors.

D. F. ESTES.

**The Imperial Hope.** By H. Pierson King. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, 1918. 183 pp. \$1.00.

Dr. King presents with clearness and force the pre-millennial view of the Second Coming of Christ. He acknowledges the pessimism of the interpretation and insists that no other interpretation of Christ's view is possible. It is all done in good spirit and will be welcomed by all who agree with him. The reviewer believes heartily in the hope of the Second Coming of Christ, but finds little ground for making the millennium a determining factor in it one way or the other. The millennium appears only in one chapter of the New Testament, and that in a book of symbols, while the Second Coming runs all through it like a golden thread of hope. But Dr. King is confident and courageous in his view, and he does not stand alone.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**The Miracle.** By Fr. Bettex. The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Ia. 2nd edition. 1918. 121 pp. 50 cts.

This book is one of the very best for the average man. The defense of miracles is made simple and clear and easy to understand. It gives wide latitude to the word miracle, but shows beyond a doubt that men who deny the existence of God assume the greatest miracle of all. The book has been improved in various ways in the new edition.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**The Psalms and Other Sacred Writings.** By Frederick Carl Eiselen. New York and Cincinnati, Methodist Book Concern. 348 pp. \$1.75 net.

This is the third volume of a series on an Introduction to the Entire Old Testament. This volume contains a discussion not only of the Psalter but of all the books included in the third division of the Hebrew Bible, known as "The Writings". The books of this group are treated in a scholarly, non-technical way, which makes the work instructive and readable for the beginner in Old Testament study. The author's aim is to present the origin, contents and significance of the various books in "The Writings". The introductory treatment of Hebrew Poetry is especially well done, while, of course, very brief. The author's advice regarding what use to make of the "titles" to the psalms is sane, while his effort to give dates for the various groups of psalms leads to dangerous territory. The Wisdom literature is well treated, as is the Book of Job. The Outline especially is well thought out. The remaining books, Ruth, Eccl., Esther, Dan., Ezra and Neh., and Chron., are introduced to the student in an interesting way. This book is adapted to the needs of Sunday school students and busy pastors.

H. C. WAYMAN.

## III. RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY.

**The Religion and Theology of Paul.** The Kerr Lectures delivered in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, during Session 1914-15. By W. Morgan, D.D. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1917. 272 pp.

Among the various courses of lectures which contribute so much to stimulate the intellectual activities of the Presbyterian churches of Scotland, the Kerr Lectures stand scarcely second to any. In this series have appeared, for example, Orr's "Christian View of God and the World" and Forrest's "Christ of History and Experience". For the latest course, the committee came across the water to Canada and chose Professor Morgan, who holds the chair of Systematic Theology in Queen's Theological College, Kingston. The object of these lectures, as stated in the preface, is to "give a systematic account of the Apostle's religion and theology in the light of modern research", and it may be said that the object is effectively compassed. Perhaps there is nowhere to be found a broader and more thorough tracing out of Paul's ideas, their relations and their parallels elsewhere, and the work of Professor Morgan must hereafter be taken into account by all students of Biblical theology.

On many points the author's conclusions may be joyfully welcomed. For example, the sections on Justification, on the Ethic of Paul, and on the Sovereignty of God are admirable. In particular, the discussion of the "Sacraments" is very full, clear and strong, the author coming out with the conclusion that Paul was wholly free from all sacramentarianism. On some other points the reviewer, as the result of his own studies, would take issue with the author, as in reference to the contention that, since Paul condemns the "flesh", he holds that the body is itself evil. Still less satisfactory is the discussion of Paul's Christology, in which the author does not seem to leave us a Christ who is in fact fully divine, a feeling which is confirmed by what he says in regard also to Christ's own teachings and claims. What he says as to the significance of the work of Christ is similarly faulty. In particular, it was scarcely to be expected that in lectures of this standing the author would repeat the too common error as to Greek usage, as he does when he says: "Whenever the idea of reconciliation occurs, it is always with man as the object (2 Cor. 5:18ff; Col. 1:20f). God is not reconciled to man" (p. 93). But all competent Greek students know that the relation of the subject and object are not the same in the case of our word reconcile and the corresponding Greek word, and consequently that not only are the ordinary translations faulty, but such a statement is wholly unfounded and simply demonstrates ignorance of Greek usage.

In any discussion of Biblical theology which aims at completeness, there must be the danger which is helpfully suggested in a sentence from Bywater, the late professor of Greek at Oxford, who says, in reference to Aristotle: "I cannot repress a suspicion that if he could come back to life again, he would be surprised to find how large a meaning we are able to read into some of his incidental utterances" ("Life", p. 136). Against this danger, Professor Morgan has guarded himself better than most, but there are still chapters or sections where he probably exaggerates the significance of the Apostle's words. A good example of this may be found in the chapter on the "Consummation", where on the basis of 2 Th. 2:3ff a page is devoted to "The Messianic Birth-pangs", an idea which there is no ground whatever for attributing to Paul. More, however, must be said of the presupposition with which the author begins his work and which underlies the whole of his discussion. In his preface, he says: "The chief outcome of the most recent work has undoubtedly been the discovery that Hellenistic religion and religious philosophy were vital factors in its formation." While the author allows a place, though really but small, to Paul's reflection on his own experience, his theology is mainly traced to two factors: Jewish ideas of his time, mainly Apocalyptic, and still more, the religious thought of his time among the Gentiles, especially as it has been traced in the "Mystery" religions. The reviewer feels that this important book is seriously limited in its permanent value by this overestimate of the influence of Paul's environment on his theology. It is, however, to be recognized that at the very end the author asserts Paul's originality, declaring that "Paul borrowed nothing which he did not transform, and his system as a whole is of the noblest creative genius" (p. 267). Nor does he think, as do so many, that, if historical relations can be traced, the value of the teaching is destroyed, or, at any rate, seriously impaired, for, as he sanely says: "An historical treatment of the Pauline constructions does not prejudice the question of their validity" (p. 268). But the author has a second presupposition still more significant and dangerous. He says: "It is no longer possible to look upon them [Paul's teachings] as truths supernaturally communicated. . . . We can go behind them. We know their source and the facts which the Apostle sought to interpret. . . . We have the right, nay, the obligation, to judge how far the Apostle's interpretations or explanations of them are adequate or tenable" (p. 268).

The book unfortunately contains no index to passages used, but Paul's own explanation of the origin of his theology does not seem to have been thought worthy of mention even as Paul's error. Some may still remember that he said under oath as to his gospel: "I also did not receive it from men, nor was I taught it, but I received it



through revelation of Jesus Christ", and many consequently thankfully receive the teachings of Paul as a part of the "ultimate data" divinely furnished for our faith.

D. F. ESTES.

**The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation.** By James Denney. Geo. H. Doran Co., New York. 332 pp. \$2.00 net.

Personality as the center of philosophic thought and of religious teaching is slowly coming to its own in the modern mind. For many years physical science gave such emphasis to law and mechanism in nature that the reality and significance of personality retired into the background. There was a strong tendency to reduce the universe to the level of mechanical law and to ignore the human world.

The great conception of personality, however, has been slowly working its way back into recognition and under much more favorable conditions than in the past. It is becoming clearly defined and the idea is being applied in a scientific and thoroughgoing manner.

The volume before us, on the Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation, by the late Prof. James Denney, is one of the best examples of the tendency referred to above. Dr. Denney's discussion is based, of course, primarily upon the Scriptures, because he is dealing with the Christian doctrine of reconciliation. He has little sympathy with the effort made in some quarters to reduce Christianity to terms which are apart from the New Testament teaching. We can only get Christianity by interpreting the original sources of the Christian religion, but at the heart of his discussion is this fundamental thought of personality and personal relationships as constituting the heart of Christianity. God as a person and man as a person in relation to God are key thoughts in Dr. Denney's discussion.

Again, he bases his exposition upon the idea of experience. Here is no discussion of abstractions. He inveighs strongly against the method which has often prevailed in theology, according to which some abstract principle is laid down and a doctrinal system deduced therefrom.

The book contains six chapters. In chapter I there is a discussion of experience as a basis for the interpretation of doctrine. Dr. Denney insists that while the history of Christianity is necessary, it is only as interpreted in the experience of believers that we can fully understand it. In his next chapter there is a condensed historical review of the doctrine of reconciliation. In the earlier period Anselm is the most outstanding figure. His doctrine of the reconciling work of Christ is expounded and criticised. The central truth contained in it, and the artificialities and inadequacies of Anselm's doctrine are pointed out. Schleiermacher and McLeod Campbell are discussed, and due

credit is given to them for their insistence upon Christian experience as necessary to the interpretation of Christianity. Much attention is given to Campbell's doctrine of the atonement, according to which Christ was the representative penitent for the human race; and while Dr. Denney does not accept Campbell's view as a whole, and objects to some of his terms, he does regard Campbell as one of the most original and powerful of all writers on the subject.

In the third chapter an outline exposition is given of the teaching of Jesus and Paul. Dr. Denney insists that Jesus himself recognized the necessity of His atoning death, and that while He said comparatively little about it as an atoning death, the apostles and disciples so understood it.

Dr. Denney's previous volume, entitled "The Death of Christ", has already given to us an exposition of his views concerning the atonement itself. The chief point to be emphasized in Dr. Denney's discussion of the need of reconciliation is the insistence upon experience in contrast with abstract systems of doctrine. In dealing with the doctrine of sin, for example, he insists that sin consists, first of all, in the overt act, and that this is followed by a sense of guilt, and that while the individual aspect of sin and guilt are prominent in the consciousness of the sinner, the social aspect of sin as wrong done to our fellows is an inevitable consequence and must arise in consciousness. Corporate sin and guilt is real, but it does not cancel individual guilt. Heredity is recognized and the unity of the race; but we are not responsible for Adam's sin, but only for our own sin. Evolution in such forms of it as cancel the idea of sin is to be rejected. Whenever evolution attempts to make of sin a mere incident in the progress of humanity and eliminates from it its character of guilt and responsibility, it announces a fiction.

Dr. Denney's discussion of death is unusually good. He shows that it is not a mere fact in the realm of biology. Death is an experience. Sin affects our view of death and our attitude toward it. God's grace enables us to conquer it. The wrath of God is a reality, and while for the most part it pertains to the future, in the teaching of Paul, yet it is felt in the present. The future is but the unfolding of the present. The revelation of the wrath of God at the last day is but the culmination of the process of the divine wrath in God's reaction against sin in the present time.

In the chapter dealing with the reconciliation, as achieved through Christ, Dr. Denney insists that the atonement is objective, in the sense that it was the act of Christ by which respect was paid to the moral order, of which sin is the violation. He argues at length to show that any theory of the atonement which makes the result of Christ's death a mere subjective impression upon the mind of the sinner falls short of the reality.

The closing chapter deals with the effects of Christ's death in the redeemed life, and is entitled "Reconciliation Realized in Human Life". Here Dr. Denney traces the stages of experience through which the sinner passes from the moment of repentance and faith, through which he is justified, over into the life of sanctification and the final life of immortality and glorification. The author insists strongly that assurance of salvation is one of the immediate fruits of justification and is a fundamental need in the Christian life. He inveighs strongly against the alleged conflict between the so-called "forsenic" and "vital" elements in Paul's doctrine of justification. He says that saving faith implies a living union between the sinner and Christ, and that there can be no such thing as a mere artificial justification, apart from the life which grows out of the union with Christ.

The book is to be commended most heartily. It is an exceedingly able exposition of a central doctrine of Christianity, and will be found stimulating and helpful to every thoughtful reader.

E. Y. MULLINS.

#### IV. WAR LITERATURE AND MISCELLANEOUS.

**Philosophy and the War.** By Ralph Tyler Flewelling. The Abingdon Press, New York and Cincinnati, 1918. 74 pp. 60 cts net.

Contrary to the popular opinion, philosophy and theology are among the most practical of all forces which shape civilization. In the 74 pages of this booklet the author makes very clear the sharp clash of two philosophies in the present war. On the side of the Allies Personalism, and on the side of the Central Powers Imperialism are in deadly combat. The author holds that no philosophy and no civilization which fails to recognize the central place of personality can satisfy. Germany disregards personality in every phase of her civilization. Against her are arrayed those nations which put men above things; human welfare above institutional forms. The system which disregards personality develops the superman with his excessive selfishness and "frightfulness" in war and peace. An individualism which is thus self-centered produces a Hohenzollern dynasty and a system of Kultur which compromises every high interest. A regard for personality on the other hand works for democracy for human rights and for true progress. The discussion is clear, convincing, timely, and valuable.

E. Y. MULLINS.

**Old Truths and New Facts.** Christian Life and Thinking as Modified by the War. The Cole Lectures for 1918. By Charles E. Jefferson, D.D. New York, Revell Company, 1918. 223 pp.

No question in the realm of religion is more mooted at the present time than the probable effect of the war upon traditional religious thought and life. All assertions on the subject must in some measure be in the nature of speculation and prophecy. The man who knows must be a seer—a see-er into the future. Dr. Jefferson is one of the most thoughtful and effective men in the American pulpit, blessed with insight and vision and spiritual eloquence. In these lectures he has given us a forecast of some of the most important effects of the war upon religion which seem to this reviewer very probable.

In his usual attractive style and with his moral and spiritual earnestness he declares his belief that out of the holocaust will come a new appreciation of the power and glory of Christ, the heavenly Christ who rules and reigns among the nations; a new conception and appreciation of vicarious suffering; a new definition and conception of prayer which will be more in accord with the teachings of the Bible and the data of experience. This last is one of the most interesting and important of the six lectures. In the other three he treats of "The Attitude to the Church", "The Use of the Bible" and "The Estimate of the World Mission of Christianity". Concerning all these vital matters, the author is optimistic. He believes the total effect of the war upon religion will be good. This is a good book to read at this time.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

**Patriotism and Radicalism.** Addresses and Letters. By Mercer Green Johnston. Boston, Sherman, French & Co., 1917. 218 pp. \$1.25.

The title of the book very well covers its contents. The author would doubtless be classed with the political and economic radicals, his sympathies are distinctly with the toilers; but he is not a maudlin pacifist or a whining socialist, but a red-blooded American. He would retain his patriotism, his loyalty to the nation, and at the same time his devotion to the cause of the working man. The addresses and letters, delivered and written on a variety of themes and occasions, are always vigorous, always poetic, always hot with enthusiasm. They make lively reading, but are sane and sympathetic with the aspirations of the great mass of the social workers of America.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.



**America—Here and Over There.** By Bishop Luther B. Wilson. The Abingdon Press, Cincinnati and New York, 1918. 75 pp. 75 cts.

Bishop Wilson has been at the front and writes of what he has seen with full sympathy and real fervor. He made these friendly addresses while home on a visit, and they met a kindly reception, as they deserved to do. They will do good in book form.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

**The Course of Christian History.** By W. J. McGlothlin, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Church History in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1918. 323 pp. \$2.00.

Within the limits of a volume of moderate size, Dr. McGlothlin has traced the course of the wonderful movement known as Christianity. And yet he has not given a bare outline sketch, but tells the story in such an interesting manner that the reader is loath to lay the book down. It is surprising to note how many facts and dates the reader almost unconsciously absorbs as he follows the thread of the story. The great men of the past move along in chronological order, not as mere shades, but as men of flesh and blood. There is a happy combination of the concrete and pictorial with critical evaluation of men and movements. The author's estimates rest upon wide and painstaking study.

Dr. McGlothlin combines scholarly accuracy and judicial fairness with strong personal conviction as to the issues which have arisen in the course of Christian history. It is far more interesting and stimulating to read a book by a man who really believes something than to follow the balanced clauses of a historian who is so afraid he may show partiality that he ends by getting nowhere. His strictures on men and denominations are never harsh, though he does not hesitate to condemn when the facts justify adverse criticism. In all matters pertaining to the history of the Baptists he aims at accuracy, and preserves a wholesome self-control. Our people will not lose interest in things Baptist by perusing this volume. The world will reap unspeakable benefit from the spread of Baptist principles and the growth of the Baptist churches.

Dr. McGlothlin's book ought to have extensive use. It was prepared primarily for college students; and its admirable arrangement of the material into periods, with appropriate subdivisions by churches, will greatly facilitate the work of the student. The division of the text into 150 numbered sections enables pupil and teacher to find the author's treatment of any given topic and makes it possible for the

student to answer the many questions proposed by the author at the close of his discussion. Additional topics for further study and research are also presented in connection with each section of the history. The author's remarkable gifts as a teacher are constantly in evidence throughout the book. There will be no excuse in the future for the omission of the study of Christian history from the curriculum of our colleges; for this volume is admirably adapted to the needs of the class room, and the subject matter has cultural value equal to that of any profane history, to say nothing of the moral and spiritual benefits flowing from the study of the Christian movement.

Ministers of the gospel ought to have a good working knowledge of the course of Christian history. Graduates of the seminary will do well to refresh their memory by reading a volume like this every year or two, and men who have had no systematic instruction in church history ought to get this book at once and devour it. Why should intelligent Sunday school teachers be content to know so little about the history of Christianity? Laymen and "elect women" would find profit and pleasure combined in reading Dr. McGlothlin's book.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

**A Century of Negro Migration.** By Carter G. Woodson, Ph.D. The Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, Washington, D. C., 1918. vi-|-221 pp.

One of the most striking features of the recent industrial life of the South has been the large migration of the Negro to the North. This movement has created serious problems for both the South and the North—in the South, problems that arise from the depletion of the available supply of labor, and in the North, problems that arise from overcrowded Negro quarters, such as idleness, disease, vice, and crime. The movement has occasioned a renewed study of the whole Negro problem from a national rather than a sectional standpoint. Newspaper articles, pamphlets and books are appearing in great numbers. The volume under review is occasioned by the present intense migration, but it is approached from the historical viewpoint. In brief, the principal movements of the Negroes from colonial days to the present are set forth, thus forming a much broader basis than we have hitherto possessed for the study of the present phase of the problem. The work was done by Negroes. It has been well done and will serve to point others to a more complete and detailed study of a question which has vital importance for all the states of the Atlantic seaboard, the South and the Middle West.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.



**The Year Book of the Churches for 1918, Covering the Year 1917.** By Clyde F. Armitage. Published for the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America by The Missionary Education Movement, New York, 1918.

This 1918 Year Book is considerably enlarged and brings together in one volume a mass of valuable information concerning all the religious bodies of America in very convenient form. Nowhere else can so many facts concerning American Christianity be found in so small a space and compact form.

**All the World in All the Word.** Twelve Studies in Missions in the Bible. By William Owen Carver, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Comparative Religion and Missions and Associate Professor of New Testament Interpretation in Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Nashville, Tenn., 1918, Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention. 72 pp. 40 cts.

These studies were prepared at the request of the Woman's Missionary Union for use in their study classes, and are suited for all voluntary study classes or for class room study in colleges.

**THE REVIEW  
AND EXPOSITOR**

---

**VOLUME XV**

**1918**